

William S. Zane, and
James C. Hilton.

To be assistant naval constructors.

Ross P. Schlback,
George S. Radford,
James L. Ackerson,
Donald R. Battles,
Richard D. Gatewood,
Isaac I. Yates,
George C. Westervelt,
Charles W. Fisher, jr.,
Holden C. Richardson,
John H. Walsh,
Edward C. Hamner, jr.,
Emory S. Land,
James Reed, jr.,
Edwin G. Kintner,
Alexander H. Van Keuren,
Paul H. Fretz, and
Roy W. Ryden.

Ensign Julius C. Townsend to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 2d day of May, 1907.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Julius C. Townsend to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 2d day of May, 1907.

Asst. Surg. Harry F. Hull to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 12th day of April, 1907.

Asst. Surg. Lewis H. Wheeler to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 22d day of April, 1907.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Charles L. Moran, a citizen of Massachusetts, and Arthur C. Stanley, a citizen of Wisconsin, to be assistant surgeons in the Navy from the 10th day of February, 1908.

POSTMASTERS, CALIFORNIA.

Enos F. Floyd to be postmaster at San Andreas, Calaveras County, Cal.

Albert L. Paulsen to be postmaster at Weaverville, Trinity County, Cal.

Robert M. Richardson to be postmaster at Sacramento, Sacramento County, Cal.

John W. Wood to be postmaster at Pasadena, Los Angeles County, Cal.

OKLAHOMA.

John W. Rickett to be postmaster at Perkins, Payne County, Okla.

WASHINGTON.

Judson J. Merriman to be postmaster at Lind, Adams County, Wash.

John F. Spangle to be postmaster at Cheney, Spokane County, Wash.

George Vetter to be postmaster at Sunnyside, Yakima County, Wash.

WISCONSIN.

Lewis P. Perry to be postmaster at Gillett, Oconto County, Wis.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, February 13, 1908.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the urgent deficiency bill and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota calls up the conference report on the urgent deficiency bill and asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The conference report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14766) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for prior years, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 5: That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 5.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

After the word "Treasury," at the end of said amendment, insert the following:

"Whenever any defendant in the case herein described makes affidavit, setting forth that there are witnesses whose evidence is material to his defense; that he can not safely go to trial without them; what he expects to prove by each of them; and that he is not possessed of sufficient means, and is actually unable to pay the fees of such witnesses, the court may in its discretion order that such witnesses be paid as herein provided.

"All witnesses subpoenaed and appearing for the Government and those appearing for the defense as above authorized, in the case mentioned in this paragraph, shall be paid out of said appropriations the per diem fees allowed by law to witnesses in other cases, together with actual, reasonable expenses of travel incurred in coming from and returning to their places of residence which said actual expenses shall be sworn to and shall be subject to the inspection, revision, and approval of the court and shall be in lieu of mileage now authorized by law to witnesses in other cases; and the tender of a sum sufficient to cover such actual expenses and the per diem fees shall be as effective for all purposes as the tender of mileage and per diem now allowed by law."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "To pay balance due the Atlanta Machine Works, of Atlanta, Georgia, four hundred and twenty-eight dollars and two cents," and the Senate agree to the same.

J. A. TAWNEY,
EDWARD B. VREELAND,
L. F. LIVINGSTON,

Managers on the part of the House.

W. B. ALLISON,
H. M. TELLER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The Clerk read the statement as follows:

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 14766, making appropriation to supply urgent deficiencies, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

On amendment numbered 5: Strikes out the appropriation of \$1,875 proposed by the Senate for payment to J. H. Bankhead as a member of the Inland Waterways Commission.

On amendment numbered 11: Inserts the provision proposed by the Senate relating to the Hyde, Dimon, Benson, and Schneider case, and adds a further provision authorizing the payment of witnesses on the part of the defense under certain conditions and in the discretion of the court, and also providing that all witnesses in the case, both for the Government and the defense, shall receive, in addition to their per diem fees, only actual traveling expenses instead of mileage, as provided by law in other cases.

On amendment numbered 26: Provides for the payment of \$428.02 as a balance due the Atlanta Machine Works, of Atlanta, Ga., instead of that sum of money claimed as interest on the principal of a judgment rendered in their behalf by the United States court at Atlanta, Ga.

J. A. TAWNEY,
EDWARD B. VREELAND,
L. F. LIVINGSTON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the report, and I will yield two minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, since the discussion in the House on day before yesterday, I have visited the Department of Justice and ascertained from the Attorney-General that the reason why this case was brought in the District of Columbia instead of in California was that the offense with which the defendants are charged was outlawed in the State of California before the Department or any officers of the Government had discovered the frauds constituting the crime; so that the defendants could not be tried in California, and the only place where the indict-

ments could be brought or the venue could be laid was here. As the committee has agreed upon an amendment which I think removes the possibility of our being a party to a proceeding which might work irreparable injustice to somebody, I do not desire, under the circumstances, further to object to the House receding from its position.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word in explanation of the provision in regard to the Hyde-Benson case. On investigation the conferees on the part of the House ascertained that since 1846 it has been the policy of the Government where the defendants in criminal actions made a showing to the court as to the witnesses they desired and to their being necessary, and that they were unable to provide for their attendance, the court in its discretion is permitted to authorize the subpoenaing of their witnesses residing within 100 miles of the place of trial. The reason for that policy is much stronger in this case, when you consider that the witnesses in this case will have to be brought here, some 3,000 miles. We also ascertained that under the law witnesses on behalf of the Government as well as the defense would be entitled to 5 cents per mile for travel, in addition to their per diem. That, in the judgment of the conferees, is a great deal more than is necessary to defray the actual traveling expenses. In fact, it has been said that some of the relatives of some of the witnesses are preparing to visit the East, claiming that they can do so on the mileage and witness fees of those subpoenaed. The paragraph in the report which I will read explains very fully the exact provision for the pay of the witness in this case, whether appearing for the Government or the defendants.

Whenever any defendant in the case herein described makes affidavit, setting forth that there are witnesses whose evidence is material to his defense; that he can not safely go to trial without them; what he expects to prove by each of them; and that he is not possessed of sufficient means, and is actually unable to pay the fees of such witnesses, the court may in its discretion order that such witnesses be paid as herein provided.

All witnesses subpoenaed and appearing for the Government, and those appearing for the defense as above authorized, in the case mentioned in this paragraph, shall be paid out of said appropriations the per diem fees allowed by law to witnesses in other cases, together with actual, reasonable expenses of travel incurred in coming from and returning to their places of residence, which said actual expenses shall be sworn to and shall be subject to the inspection, revision, and approval of the court and shall be in lieu of mileage now authorized by law to witnesses in other cases; and the tender of a sum sufficient to cover such actual expenses and the per diem fees shall be as effective for by law.

So, for that reason, Mr. Speaker, we have modified the law in regard to fees and traveling expenses as to the Government's witnesses, as well as the defendants' witnesses in this case, providing for their actual traveling expenses, to be sworn to, and to be modified or revised and approved by the court. In that way, I think, the expense of the trial, if it is had here, will be very materially reduced.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

Mr. WANGER. If it is a good and necessary thing to modify the allowance for witnesses in this case, would it not be an equally commendable action to revise the law generally in that particular?

Mr. TAWNEY. I think so; but that is a question that should be addressed to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield to my colleague on the committee [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, while I indorse the sentiment of the conferees, I think this House ought to emphasize the fact that we disapprove of bringing cases from the Pacific coast to this city when it can possibly be avoided. The witnesses for both parties and the assistant United States attorneys must all come here. And this is an enormous and an unnecessary expense. The crimes were committed there, and they should be tried there in order to save expense. That is not all. There is a constitutional right of the defendants in criminal suits, a right that ought to be regarded by this House, that they should be tried where the crimes are committed. The House ought to emphasize its disapproval of that course whenever possible.

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER].

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that the remarks just made by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] we all concur in, except that he assumes that where parties live they commit the crime.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No; I did not say that.

Mr. KEIFER. He said we ought to protest against bringing people from the Pacific coast here for trial. We have always

done that. The Constitution prohibits that. The laws of the country prohibit that. If the people from the Pacific coast come to the District of Columbia and commit a crime, they will have to come here and answer for it.

I want to ask the chairman [Mr. TAWNEY] one question, and that is, whether in the last amendment agreed to, No. 26, the amendment is so drawn in connection with the bill that the receipt of the \$428.02 shall be accepted in full of the balance due the Atlanta Machine Works?

Mr. TAWNEY. I understand the gentleman is now satisfied.

Mr. KEIFER. Is the provision such that if this House accepted that it will be satisfactory?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I want to ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] about the allowance of interest on the judgment.

Mr. TAWNEY. We do not provide for payment of any interest on the judgment. We provide for the payment of the balance due on the judgment.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. But that balance is interest, is it not?

Mr. TAWNEY. It is claimed as interest, but this provision does not recognize it as interest, and it can never be used as a precedent hereafter.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. The Government does not allow interest, does it?

Mr. TAWNEY. No.

Mr. MANN. Except in this case.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

PROTECTION OF GAME IN ALASKA.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The bill H. R. 14789 is upon the Union Calendar, and unanimous consent is asked to discharge that committee from the consideration of the bill and that it be considered in the House at this time. The Clerk will report the bill.

[The bill was read at length.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I noticed in the latter part of the reading of the bill that any officer of the United States is authorized to arrest any person having a skin, etc., of game taken in Alaska, anywhere in the United States. I would ask the gentleman if I am right, if the interpretation is as broad as that, and if such drastic legislation is necessary in order to protect the game in Alaska?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will say to the gentleman that it does provide that "any marshal, deputy marshal, or warden in or out of Alaska may arrest without warrant any person found violating any of the provisions of this act, or of any regulations herein provided." And that is the law now. That is simply a reenactment of the present law.

Mr. PAYNE. What changes are there in this law?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The changes in this law from the present law are these: That under present conditions the Secretary of Agriculture has control of the game laws in Alaska. This bill provides for a license system and places it under the control of the governor.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Why should it not be under the control of the governor of Alaska?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It does place it under the control of the governor.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Then what has the Secretary of Agriculture to do with it, anyhow?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The Secretary of Agriculture, under this bill, has nothing to do with it; but he has under the present law. The object of this bill is to charge a license, and the proceeds of that license will go in a game fund, to be used for game protection, and placed under the control of the governor of Alaska.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Is it true that if a man had a deer-skin that came from Alaska, he could be arrested in the District of Columbia? Is that true?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Well, I would not want to say that. I can read what it does. The object of the provision in the law, as I understand it and as it is to-day, is this: That it provides that any marshal or deputy marshal or warden may arrest, without warrant, any person found violating any of the provisions of this act, whether it be in Alaska or in California.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If he affirms that it came from Alaska, why I could be arrested in the District without having to go back there to be tried.

Mr. PAYNE. That would not have to be affirmed. It would only have to be charged that it came from Alaska. All that he has got to do is to affirm that it came from Alaska.

Mr. SULZER. That law ought to be amended.

Mr. PAYNE. This seems to be a splendid opportunity to change that drastic provision.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It seems to me we might strike that clause out.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CRUMPACKER rose.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I can not yield to all gentlemen at once.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I want to make a suggestion about the rules and regulations proposed. The law authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make certain rules and regulations, and that is the law now. Does not the provision say that any person who violates any provision of the law, any regulation made by the governor or the Secretary of Agriculture, shall be guilty of a crime? This law as it now is puts it in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, and I infer and understand from its reading that the law prohibits the killing of game during certain seasons and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture, under certain rules and regulations, to permit the killing during those seasons for certain purposes. If that be true, I think the rules and regulations are all right. But if it permits the Secretary of Agriculture to make rules and regulations in addition to the provisions of this law and then undertakes to make those a basis of crime, then I think it is wrong. What does it do in that respect?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will say to the gentleman that this bill very much restricts it in that respect over the present law. It says he shall make rules and regulations, under the provisions of this bill, to this effect only: That he shall prescribe different times for the killing of the game. This vests the control of the season in him. They discovered that the caribou were about to be exterminated on the Kenai Peninsula, and the only way of restricting them was to prescribe a period of two years, while in the other the period is of five years. It was found necessary to leave that much discretion in the hands of the Secretary.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I agree that it is necessary to vest great discretion, and it would be convenient in an administrative officer of the Government, and it would be impracticable to meet all these phases in a bill enacted by Congress, but the question of convenience is not one to be considered as much. It is largely a question of power and administration. I have always opposed the authorizing of Department officials to make regulations that furnish the basis of a criminal prosecution. I believe the protection of the liberty of the people of the United States is of as much importance as the protection of game in Alaska, and probably a little more. But I understand now, as I said a moment ago, the power of the Secretary of Agriculture is to make rules and regulations as within the prohibited period fixed by the law, and the Secretary may prescribe that game may be killed within the prohibited period in some districts. Then it is a proper thing to do.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; he can not.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me, I understand from a hasty reading of the bill that it authorizes a permanent indefinite appropriation. Before I can consent to the creation of any more permanent indefinite appropriations, I want to know what they are, and for the present I will object.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I hope the gentleman will withhold his objection. This does not carry any appropriation. Mr. TAWNEY. It does appropriate, for fees, a permanent indefinite appropriation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota objects.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Post-Office Department is hereby authorized to send for persons and papers in any examination within its jurisdiction.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 16493) limiting and restricting the right of entry and assignment under the

desert-land law and authorizing an extension of time within which to make final proof, with two minor amendments to correct errors in printing.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act the right to make entry of desert lands under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1877, entitled "An act to provide for the sale of desert lands in certain States and Territories," as amended by the act approved March 3, 1891, entitled "An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," shall be restricted to surveyed public lands of the character contemplated by said acts, and no such entries of surveyed lands shall be allowed or made of record: *Provided, however*, That any individual qualified to make entry of desert lands under said acts who has, prior to survey, taken possession of a tract of unsurveyed desert land not exceeding in area 320 acres in compact form, and has reclaimed or has in good faith commenced the work of reclaiming the same, shall have the preference right to make entry of such tract under said acts, in conformity with the public land surveys, within ninety days after the filing of the approved plat of survey in the district land office.

SEC. 2. That from and after the date of the passage of this act no assignment of an entry made under said acts shall be allowed or recognized, except it be to an individual who is shown to be qualified to make entry under said acts of the land covered by the assigned entry, and such assignments may include all or part of an entry; but no assignment to or for the benefit of any incorporation or association shall be authorized or recognized.

SEC. 3. That any entrymen under the above acts who shall show to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of the General Land Office that he has in good faith complied with the terms, requirements, and provisions of said acts, but that because of some unavoidable delay in the construction of the irrigating works, intended to convey water to the said lands, he is, without fault on his part, unable to make proof of the reclamation and cultivation of said land, as required by said acts, shall, upon filing his corroborated affidavit with the land office in which said land is located, setting forth said facts, be allowed an additional period of not to exceed three years, within the discretion of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, within which to furnish proof as required by said acts of the completion of said work.

With the following amendments:

Page 1, line 12, strike out "surveyed" and insert "unsurveyed."

Page 2, line 15, strike out "incorporations" and insert "corporations."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. PAYNE. I want to reserve the right to object to this.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, if the House will allow me about five minutes, and give me their attention, I think I can explain this bill fully.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to make a statement for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I want to ask the gentleman if this bill has the approval of a committee of the House?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill contemplates certain restrictions of the desert-land law, which were originally suggested by the General Land Office, and which have been carefully considered by the Committee on the Public Lands and unanimously indorsed by that committee.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Has it been indorsed by the Commissioner of the General Land Office?

Mr. MONDELL. The proposed changes have the approval of the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the Secretary of the Interior.

The provisions of the first two sections of the bill were embraced in a bill passed at the last session of Congress and discussed on the floor at length and approved by the House; so that the only new matter contained in the bill is the provision in the third section, under which the Commissioner of the General Land Office may, in his discretion, upon a proper showing on the part of the entryman of inability to complete his irrigating work within the three years allowed by law, grant an extension such as may be necessary, not exceeding three years, in which to complete the work necessary to the irrigation and the reclamation of the lands.

This legislation is important and necessary. The land officials have on various occasions called attention to the difficulty of administering the desert-land law and do justice and equity, owing to the fact that under the law the entryman should complete his work within three years, and if reclamation is not completed within four years from the date of entry his title is extinguished.

It often occurs, and more frequently now than in former times, that owing to the very great expense of reclamation, the distance that water must be brought for the reclamation of land, the rough territory over which ditches are carried, the broken character of much of the land irrigated, it is utterly impossible for the ordinary entryman, by the exercise of the utmost diligence, to complete the reclamation of his land within the period provided by law.

In numerous instances our committee has been appealed to to pass special bills to extend the period, and the House has passed upon a number of bills of that character. In a late

Congress a bill extending for three years the period in behalf of certain entrymen in southern Colorado was passed.

Mr. BONYNGE. In California.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is correct. We also passed a bill a short time before that with reference to Colorado. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BONYNGE] is fully informed on this subject, having given it much attention, and this provision of the bill is substantially a bill introduced by him. To sum up, Mr. Speaker, the first two sections contain proper restrictions on desert entry, restrictions indorsed by the Department and which our committee has unanimously reported twice, the House having passed such a bill in the last Congress. The third section provides for the necessary extension of time upon proper showing in order that the entryman may not lose his land because of his inability to complete the irrigation in the brief period allowed by law.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. Does this bill involve any extension of the irrigation system?

Mr. MONDELL. No extension. It simply provides that where the entryman is on the land under the present law, and in a given case he is unable to complete the irrigation within the three years provided by law, the Commissioner may, upon a proper showing, give him a reasonable period in which to complete the work.

Mr. HARDWICK. The reason that I asked the question is that in a recent case, Kansas against Colorado, 206 United States, the Supreme Court—

Mr. MONDELL. This can not possibly affect that question, because it does not provide for any irrigation that is not already provided for by law.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. This bill relates exclusively to the desert lands and to irrigation and reclamation of those lands. I would like to know if this subject has ever been referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation?

Mr. MONDELL. Under the rules of the House, bills of this character have always been referred to the Committee on the Public Lands. There has never been any exception to that rule, and under the rules this bill could have gone nowhere except to the Public Lands Committee, for it deals entirely with the passing of title under certain conditions and does not, like the national irrigation law, deal with the manner in which the land shall be irrigated. So the bill could have gone to no other committee. It was before our committee in two Congresses, and the first provisions were passed by the House without objection in the last Congress.

Mr. PAYNE. If I recollect the rule, all bills relating to the irrigation of public lands go to that committee. I think that committee would have jurisdiction of the bill, and it might have been referred to that committee. Perhaps the Committee on the Public Lands also has jurisdiction.

Mr. SULZER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. MONDELL. I will gladly yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SULZER. I understand the bill has the approval of the Commissioner of the General Land Office?

Mr. MONDELL. More than that, Mr. Speaker; two provisions of the bill have been recommended or suggested by the President's Public Land Commission, by the Commissioners, and by the Secretary and indorsed by the House. The last provision has been indorsed and recommended by the present Commissioner, the present Secretary, and approved by the committee.

Mr. REEDER. Does the gentleman say that the bill has received the unanimous report of the Committee on the Public Lands?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; and we have gone over it very carefully.

Mr. REEDER. I want to say, in regard to the suggestion by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], that I believe there is a mistake in referring this class of bills to the Committee on the Public Lands, because I think the whole object of the bill is irrigation.

Mr. MANN. This bill has nothing to do with irrigation.

Mr. REEDER. It has all to do with it.

Mr. BONYNGE. It has nothing to do with the Government project of irrigation, but only to the irrigation by individuals.

Mr. REEDER. All matters pertaining to irrigation should be referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands. I realize that this is not the time to make this point; and inasmuch as it has the unanimous approval of the

Committee on the Public Lands, I have no doubt that it is all right.

Mr. MONDELL. Under the rules, all bills relating "to the lands of the United States" go to the Committee on the Public Lands. This is such a bill, and it clearly belongs to our committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MONDELL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

CITY OF WOODWARD, OKLA.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 12773) granting to the city of Woodward, in the State of Oklahoma, lot 2, in block 48, for park and other public purposes, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. This bill seems to be upon the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULTON. Well, it has been favorably reported by the committee.

Mr. MANN. Oh, we can not take up bills on the Private Calendar by unanimous consent.

Mr. FULTON. It should not be on the Private Calendar, as I understand it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Oklahoma that in the last two Congresses, and so far in this Congress, the Chair has not submitted requests for unanimous consent to consider bills on the Private Calendar. That is the method the Chair takes of objecting. The Chair will not take the time to explain to the gentleman why, but Members generally understand the position of the Chair.

Mr. FULTON. I had no idea that it was on the Private Calendar and I do not think it belongs there.

The SPEAKER. It seems to be on the Private Calendar.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 16882, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from Georgia as to what disposition of time he wishes, conceding that we go on in general debate the remainder of the day.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I desire to have two hours and thirty minutes.

Mr. BINGHAM. The remainder of the time to be given to this side. Then do I understand that we can close general debate to-day?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman gives me that time, that is satisfactory.

Mr. BINGHAM. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate close to-day, two hours and a half of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the balance by myself.

The SPEAKER. Pending the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the gentleman asks unanimous consent that general debate close to-day, two hours and a half of that time to be in the control of the gentleman from Georgia. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, with Mr. LAWRENCE in the chair.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] such time as he may wish.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, Members of Congress and the public generally were greatly interested in the recent decision of the Supreme Court which held that the law regulating the liability of interstate railroads to their employees, passed by the last Congress, was unconstitutional. The popular impression produced by the decision, so far as I have been able to

estimate it, is that the power of Congress over interstate commerce has been unexpectedly and undesirably limited and that this class of legislation has received a serious setback. I think this impression is quite unwarranted and comes from a superficial view of the decision, and that really the opinions delivered by the judges strengthen the power of Congress over interstate commerce. The law was held unconstitutional because in its terms it extends to employees engaged in purely State commerce. Whether this was the intent of the persons who drew the bill I do not know. They may have thought it wise to draw it as comprehensive as possible, as that would be the only way of ascertaining to what extent Congress could go, but I think few Members of this House supposed it applied to purely State commerce, or thought such an application was constitutional.

The judges of the Supreme Court differed in their interpretation of the law, the majority holding that it did in terms cover State commerce and the minority holding that it did not; but all the judges agreed that Congress had not the power to legislate over employees engaged in purely State commerce, so that question is settled, and settled I believe in accord with the general sentiment and expectation of the bar, of Congress, and of the people.

But while the court has thus decided that this particular statute was unconstitutional, its decision has established one principle which ought to give the friends of this class of legislation ample compensation for their disappointment. That is the principle that the relation of employees to the railroads, of master to servant, as lawyers call it, is within the jurisdiction of Congress under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution, whenever the servant is engaged in interstate business. This principle has been much disputed and until this decision has been in doubt, but now six judges unite in confirming the doctrine and the other three simply decline to express an opinion, so that a strong majority, if not the full court, indorse it. This is of great value, for of course this principle is vital to the law, and to have it officially established is solace for a little delay.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts as to whether or not the proposition to which he now refers is not more or less in the nature of a dictum. The real issue is the constitutionality of the act, and the court held it unconstitutional on other grounds, so that in a sense this proposition may be more or less dictum.

Mr. GILLET. It is a dictum, I admit, because it was not necessarily involved in the decision, but it is a dictum upon which six of the judges agree. It was not a dictum as far as the four minority judges are concerned, for the doctrine was a necessary foundation of their argument, and two of the majority judges expressly declare their acquiescence in the doctrine, and the three other judges expressly reserve their opinion. In other words, they apparently are in doubt, so that we may fairly say, I think, that six of the judges of the court are committed to it and the other three are doubtful.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That proposition applies to all the employees of the Government.

Mr. GILLET. It does, of course.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Whether in manufacturing or otherwise employed.

Mr. GILLET. That would apply to all.

It will now be simple to amend the law in conformity with this decision—to make it in terms apply exclusively to interstate commerce, and thus to accomplish all that most of its friends expected. In drafting this new law care should be exercised that it does not again exceed our constitutional limits, that it should conform to the decision of the Supreme Court, and, in my opinion, there are other modifications which could be introduced to the improvement of the bill.

But my main purpose in speaking to-day was not to discuss the recent decision of the court, but to take advantage of the present interest in the subject to impress upon the House that there are other bills upon this subject quite as deserving as this one. Railroad employees are already protected by legislation of the individual States, and this only gives them a law somewhat more favorable than most of them had before, and which is uniform throughout the country.

But there is a class of men who have no remedy at all and who not only get no advantage from the ameliorating statutes which a sense of justice has forced upon nearly all of the States, but who can not even appeal to the old common law, with its antiquated master and servant doctrine, and who constitute, I believe, the only force of workingmen in the country who have absolutely no redress for any injury which may happen to them in the course of their employment. I refer to the thousands of men who are employed by the United States in its numerous manufacturing establishments.

These men as yet have not been touched at all by the liberal

spirit of the modern statutes. They still have no right to recover damages, even if their injuries resulted solely from the negligence of their employer or from defects in the buildings or machinery. No matter how blameless they were, no matter how culpable the employer, they must bear the loss alone and have no appeal to any law, no redress in any court.

Before we enact law giving still more protection to the railroad employees, who already are much protected, would it not be fair and reasonable and right to do something for these men who have no protection at all? My attention was drawn to this subject years ago, because there is located in the city where I live a Government armory employing between one and two thousand men, nearly all skilled mechanics, and a large portion of them using machinery. Accidents frequently happen to them, but, no matter how they may be caused, they have no redress in law. It is an anachronism that such a state of affairs should exist.

The President has, in several messages, called attention to it, and in his last message discusses it at length. The first executive suggestion of it so far as I am aware was in the report of Hon. W. H. Moody in 1902, when he was Secretary of the Navy, directing the attention of Congress to the need of such action for the navy-yards. But long before there had been any Presidential suggestion I had, in the Fifty-sixth Congress, introduced practically the same bill which I advocate to-day, and had pressed it upon the Judiciary Committee and have urged it in every Congress since. Last year the subcommittee reported it favorably, and I hope this year it will become a law. It is modeled on our Massachusetts statute, and is much more conservative and moderate than the railroad law enacted last year. But I have no prejudice in favor of my own bill. I am willing it should be amended or liberalized or narrowed as much as may be thought wise. What I want is that some action shall be taken, that these men shall have some legal rights. That there is need of it, you can not doubt. Cases which demand it are occurring constantly.

There is now in the hospital at Springfield a young man with a bullet wound in his leg received while he was working at his bench in the armory. In the room below they were testing rifles. The ceiling was not sufficiently armored and a shot glancing upward from the target went through the floor and stopped in this workman's leg. He was guilty of no negligence, was in the performance of his duty, and in any other shop would have had a clear case of damages against his employer. But because he was working for the United States Government he is remediless and can exact no compensation.

I think that the Government ought to abandon this exemption from doing justice which the law now gives it, that when it becomes a manufacturer it ought not at the same time to assert the privileges of a sovereign and claim that it is above the law, and that before it says to railroad corporations, "You shall be more liberal to your employees," it ought at least to have conscience enough to give to its own employees what every railroad employee already enjoys.

If it extracts the beam from its own eye, it may be able to see more clearly the mote in other eyes, and so I think honor, consistency, justice, and the spirit of the age all demand that we give at once to this large body of deserving citizens at the very least the same rights that every other class of citizens already enjoys under the law.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. GILLET. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. You have stated that a bill of this character has been before Congress for a number of years and at one time was reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary. Will you please tell the country why this bill has not been passed that you are talking about now?

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I wish I knew myself just why it has not been passed. I suppose the main reason is there were not enough persons affected by it and interested in it. Like a great many other just and meritorious bills, it never has been able to get the time of Congress, and the purpose of my now addressing the committee is that it may get the attention of Congress. [Applause.] I am glad to see the gentleman thinks it is unreasonable that it has not been already passed.

Mr. STERLING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLET. Yes.

Mr. STERLING. I understand that the gentleman has introduced a bill at this session relating to this question?

Mr. GILLET. Yes.

Mr. STERLING. Giving the right of action to these employees?

Mr. GILLET. Yes.

Mr. STERLING. I would like to know if the gentleman's

attention was called to a bill introduced a few days ago by myself not giving a right of action to the employees, but giving a compensation where the injury occurred not through negligence of the employee, fixing the minimum amount of compensation, the amount allowed to be determined by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor; have you seen that bill?

Mr. GILLETT. I have not seen that bill, and I have no pride in authorship in my own bill to prevent my supporting any other which aims to accomplish the same result and right this wrong.

Mr. STERLING. I asked the gentleman if he has ever considered the question along this line, and I wanted to know what his views are in reference to such a bill.

Mr. GILLETT. I have not heard of such a proposition. All I want, Mr. Chairman, is a remedy, and if the gentleman's bill affords that and the House prefers it, I am perfectly willing to unite upon that. [Loud applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. LITTLEFIELD having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CROCKETT, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 12420. An act to extend immediate transportation privileges to the subport of Alburg, in the customs collection district of Vermont.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14766) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution 24.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a survey and examination to be made of Beaufort Harbor, North Carolina, with a view to improving the navigability thereof, and providing a channel of 8-foot depth from the channel at the bulkhead in the Newport River to the town of Beaufort and from the town of Beaufort to the channel at Gallants Point, and to submit estimates therefor.

Senate concurrent resolution 26.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made of the mouth of Chickasabogue Creek, in the State of Alabama, with a view to opening the same, and to submit estimates therefor.

Senate concurrent resolution 27.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause an examination and survey to be made of Bayou Le Batre, in the State of Alabama, with a view to deepening the same, and to submit estimates therefor.

Senate concurrent resolution 30.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a survey contiguous to the town of Morehead City, N. C., beginning at the mouth of Hard Scrabble Slough, running westwardly between the said town and the marshes in front of the same, to the main channel of Bogue Sound, in the west of Sandy Point Shoals, with a view of estimating the cost of obtaining a channel in said part of Bogue Sound 100 feet in width and of a depth of 5, 8, and 10 feet at low water.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I now yield one hour to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] is recognized for one hour. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, within the last few days we have been edified by a series of somewhat remarkable speeches, evidencing a high order of ability in our membership, on which I most heartily congratulate the country, for no man more rejoices in the honor and glory of this House than I do. These speeches have been devoted chiefly to a discussion of the President's message and of the President himself. Views widely divergent as the poles have been freely expressed as to the merits and demerits of this extraordinary man, one of the most extraordinary in American history. [Applause.] In this case, as in most others, the line of safety, fairness, and justice is found in medias res. In my county there was a lawyer who so frequently urged courts and juries to take "a reasonable view" that his saying passed into a proverb. That is exactly what should be done touching the President; but that is precisely what has not been done as a rule. He

is such a belligerent personage that his slightest word is a challenge to mortal combat, and he can not express an opinion on any question under heaven, even on a subject so prosaic and threadbare as the prospective state of the weather, without precipitating a row, his extreme admirers declaring that there never has been such a weather prophet on earth since Adam and Eve were driven with flaming swords from Paradise, and his extreme enemies vociferating that he knows no more about the weather than does the ground hog. [Laughter and applause.]

Upon this issue there would be joined a battle royal, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing. Colonel Roosevelt laughs to scorn the words of the great Cardinal:

Love thyself last; cherish those hearts that hate thee;
Still in thy right hand carry gentle peace
To silence envious tongues.

On the contrary, he acts on the theory of the bellicose Irishman who said: "When you see a head, hit it." [Laughter and applause.] He has whacked so many heads that divers reactionary leaders are in the political hospital for repairs. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Still others of them perambulate the earth with poultices and plasters adorning their craniums. [Laughter.] His whole public life has been one long succession of spectacular fights. No man was ever more viciously assailed by men of his own party, and none was ever, while still in the flesh, so lavishly lauded by some of the opposing party. But the truth is that this extraordinary man has waxed stronger and stronger by waging battle. Even defeat has made him a larger and more commanding figure. Never in his militant career was he more savagely abused or more extravagantly praised than at the present juncture.

So, amid the swirl of things, the deluge of words, the shoutings of the captains, the beating of tom-toms, the groans of crippled and wounded Republicans, the furious yells of friend and foe, one who is the personal friend of Theodore Roosevelt, the man; who is the opponent of Theodore Roosevelt, the politician or the statesman, as the case may be; and who desires to take a "reasonable view" of the saying and doings of Theodore Roosevelt, the Chief Magistrate of a mighty people, perhaps has little chance to be heard in this babel of voices. But I will have my say, and here it is: Personally I like him. He has treated me well and I have tried to treat him well. After the manner of strong men he has pronounced virtues and glaring faults of character. I have never abused him. I have never grown hysterical in admiration of him. When he is right, I support him cordially. When he is wrong, I fight him tooth and nail. This line of conduct I have pursued steadfastly in the past, and I shall adhere to it without shadow of turning even unto the end. It seems to me that that is the way in which he would desire to be treated. He must entertain ineffable contempt for the invertebrate sycophants who grovel before him on all occasions, and who, no matter what he says or what he does, throw high their sweaty caps in air, shouting: "Io! Triumphe! Io! Triumphe!"

It is said that "a king can have no friends," and it seems that a President of the United States—any President—is in the same unhappy situation. It is claimed that Colonel Roosevelt is better than his party—this he could easily be without running any imminent risk of being translated, after the fashion of Elijah, in a chariot of fire by reason of his goodness. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But whatever his virtues, whatever his faults, whatever else he may be, he is not a Democrat [applause on the Democratic side]; for democracy means the least amount of government the people can get along with consistent with the fullest enjoyment of their rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness [applause on the Democratic side], while republicanism means the greatest amount of government that the people will stand [applause on the Democratic side], and he of all men is the apostle of the maximum quantity of government. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Occasionally, very much to the delight of Democrats and the utter confusion of Republicans, he appropriates or absorbs, borrows or seizes, a Democratic idea and from his high coign of vantage advocates it with tremendous force; for he obeys to the letter at least one Scriptural injunction: "What soever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might;" and it is the heavy hand of Theodore Roosevelt or his "big stick" which has driven so many Republicans pell-mell into the Cave of Adulam, where there is weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth and much profane swearing. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

So far as he has advocated Democratic ideas, so far as he has mauled wicked Republicans with his mailed fist or has thumped them with his big stick, he deserves the unstinted

praise and gratitude of all lovers of our country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Twice in this speech I have applied to him the word "extraordinary," which seems to me the adjective best fitting his character and his endowments. Whether he is a great man I do not know. You, Mr. Chairman, do not know. Nobody knows. There is an old saying, "Count no man happy till he is dead." It is a wise and sane rule to acclaim no man great until he is in his grave. We have not the perspective necessary to fix his status in history, and it is sheer folly to attempt it. Lord Bacon, the most philosophic of mankind, with clear vision and deep pathos, expressed the same idea in his last will and testament, when he said: "For my name and memory, I leave it to men's charitable speeches, and to foreign nations, and to the next age." His proud confidence was not misplaced, for his fame has augmented from the day of his death down to the present hour.

Individually, I wish the President well in the White House till March 4, 1909, when I hope he will quit it forever. I congratulate him from the bottom of my heart on turning a deaf ear to those unwise or selfish friends who have endeavored to persuade him to violate the wholesome precedents of one hundred and eleven years, for no President will ever be elected to a third term until the Republic is on its last legs. After he leaves that historic mansion, the goal of so many ambitious hearts, the tomb of so many ardent hopes, I wish him happiness, prosperity, and length of days.

We can all be honest even if we can not be great, and if you Republican bigwigs were perfectly candid, you would confess that you are not nearly so much enamored of the President as you appear to be. You grow red in the face, thereby inviting vertigo or apoplexy in exalting him to the skies; for he is still the dispenser in chief of pie, and a Republican statesman bereft of pie is a spectacle to make the angels weep. When I see you trying to apotheosize him by mere lip service, it seems to me, "The lady doth protest too much."

When a lad I had a classmate who pronounced the Latin word "vulgus," which means "the common people," "voolgoose." By reason of some peculiarity in his vocal apparatus it sounded like "bullgoose." So the boys fell into the habit, as a joke, of pronouncing it "bullgoose." It is the "common people" among the Republicans, the "vulgus" of the Romans, the "bullgoose" of the college boys, that constitute Theodore Roosevelt's shield and buckler among the Republicans. No man has a livelier comprehension of that fact than Republican Representatives.

I have heard that in the last campaign sundry Republican Representatives sought and obtained from the President certificates of good character to help them pull through. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] We all know that when the Republican managers came to the conclusion that the result was doubtful, he wrote that famous letter to "My dear Mr. Watson" which was used as a blanket certificate of good character for all Republican Members of Congress except the unfortunate Mr. Wadsworth. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] But even his epistle to Mr. Watson could not prevent the Republican majority in the House from falling from 114 to 55. When "Uncle Joe" read the returns he must have been in the frame of mind of Pyrrhus, King of Epirus, when surveying a hard-won field, he exclaimed: "Another such victory and we are undone." [Applause on the Democratic side.] A self-evident truth; and even the ready-letter-writer in the White House will not be able to write enough letters between now and the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November next to return another Republican majority to this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Everybody knows that the tide is running strong against you, and any district that is held by a Republican here by less than 3,000 plurality is more liable to go Democratic than Republican, and, God be praised, there are forty-four such districts. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Every Republican holding his seat by less than 2,000 is "our meat" in November. [Laughter and applause.] There are thirty-seven of them, and we only need twenty-eight to organize the next House. [Renewed applause on the Democratic side.]

In addition to these there are fifteen or twenty other districts in which for various reasons we have an equal chance to win.

The other day the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] said: "To the Administration of Theodore Roosevelt the student of the future will point as the period when the people came into possession of their own." The gentleman was mistaken. The exact date to which the student of the future will point as that of the coming of the people into their own will be March 4, 1909, when a Democrat will be inaugurated President at the east front of the Capitol, backed by such a Democratic majority in this House as will induce even a Republican Senate

to enact into law the people's will. For eleven years we have been out of power, but we have it on high authority that—

Sweet are the uses of adversity,
Which, like the toad, ugly and venomous,
Wears yet a precious jewel in his head—

in this case the precious jewel of Democratic victory.

The Democrats are getting together everywhere, and the Republican party presents to the astounded gaze of men the appearance of a "dissolving view." [Laughter and applause.] You will be extremely lucky if you get out of Chicago without nominating two Republican tickets instead of one. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

I am not going to venture upon any discussion of the financial question. There never have been but two men in the world that knew all about it. My friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] is one of them, and unfortunately the other is dead. [Laughter and applause.] But my friend from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] who made a wonderfully strong speech yesterday, knows a good deal about the financial question, though he modestly disclaimed it. No man that heard him did more to praise him by his action, by his grimaces, by his smiles and nods, than did Mr. HILL of Connecticut; and "praise from Sir Hubert Stanley is praise indeed."

First and last in this debate a great deal has been said about the existing panic. There has been much loud assertion to the effect that the President had no hand in producing it. After all is said that can be said, one fact stands out in bold relief, and that is that it is a Republican panic. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] The self-constituted defenders of the President declare vehemently that Harriman and his crowd did it. Harriman and his crowd retort angrily that the President and his crowd did it. But no difference which one of the two crowds did it, it is "a Republican panic." [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] for, let it never be forgotten that Harriman and his crowd are Republicans, as well as the President and his crowd. It does not become "an innocent bystander" to undertake to decide which are the ideal Republicans. [Laughter.] One thing we do know, however, and that is that Mr. Harriman was a delegate to the last national Republican convention which nominated Colonel Roosevelt by a unanimous vote and that he has been a liberal contributor to Republican campaign funds. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Two or three years ago he was "My dear Harriman." [Laughter.] Now he is another sort of Harriman with a big, big D. [Laughter.] But whatever else he was, or is, he is a Republican of high degree. I am not certain that it is any particular business of mine to pick the Republican nominees for President. Perhaps, however, I may be permitted to suggest that the ideal Republican for President would be Edward H. Harriman [laughter and applause on the Democratic side], and if you fill out the Republican ticket with that other eminent Republican, John D. Rockefeller, the ticket will be very strong in Wall street. It will have one advantage. They can furnish their own barrel, and then the Republican rooters instead of singing "rally 'round the flag, boys," can sing "rally 'round the barrel, boys." [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] No doubt after Rockefeller pays that \$29,000,000 fine, if he ever does, that Judge Kenesaw Mountain Landis imposed on him, he will still have oil enough left to grease up the machine. [Laughter.] There would be another advantage in the Harriman and Rockefeller Republican Presidential ticket, and that is, there would be no necessity for them to plunder the great life insurance companies, thereby robbing the widows and orphans of the land of the provision made for them by kind husbands and loving fathers.

There is an old saying that "chickens come home to roost." For eleven years the Democrats have been stripped of every shred of power. In 1893 there was a panic under the McKinley high-tariff bill while a Democrat sat in the White House. Every mother's son of you in the House, in the public press, and upon the stump vociferated volubly and repeatedly that it was a Democratic panic. Now, no man can deny that this panic has come after eleven years of Republican rule, under a Republican Administration, and by your own logic you can not deny that it is a Republican panic. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You are estopped from so doing, and you might as well walk up and take your medicine. It is bitter as gall, but you will have to swallow it.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] in his speech the other day tried to minimize the panic, and intimated that it is not much of a panic, anyway. I read somewhere once that about the thirtieth day of the flood a stiff-necked antediluvian, sitting in the limbs of a tall tree on the top of a high mountain, as Noah floated past in the ark, shook the water out of his hair and remarked: "This is not much of a shower, after all."

[Laughter.] The gentleman from Iowa must be some blood kin to that cheerful antediluvian. [Laughter.]

I wish it were true that it is not much of a panic. I have not much property, but it has cost me already about one-fourth of what I had. I wish it were true, as he says, that it is not much of a panic; but it is not true, for another distinguished Iowa statesman, ex-governor and ex-Secretary of the Treasury, Leslie M. Shaw, who is a Republican Presidential possibility, in a speech that he made not long ago, used this remarkable language:

Banks must have been sound, or widespread ruin would have marked the stringency of 1907, which is generally conceded to have been the severest the world has ever witnessed.

That is certainly a sweeping statement:

The stringency of 1907, which is generally conceded to have been the severest the world has ever witnessed.

Mr. Shaw might have truthfully added that it is a Republican panic, and gives the lie direct to the Republican platform declaration of 1904, that "a Republican tariff is always followed by business prosperity and a Democratic tariff by business adversity." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

That fake is thoroughly exploded—"gone where the woodbine twineth," dead as the men who lived before the flood. It helped you amazingly in 1904. No sane man will believe it any more forever—

All the king's horses and all the king's men
Can't put Humpty Dumpty together again.

[Laughter.]

But the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], in a vain endeavor to shift the burden of this panic, said that as long as we went on in the way we have been going we would always have periodical panics, and I believe that my distinguished friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] the other day indorsed that idea. But why in the name of heaven did not you Republicans say that in 1893 and in the fifteen years that followed? [Applause on the Democratic side.] That philosophy of the gentleman from Iowa comes too late. It is a kind of deathbed repentance. I will read you another sentence or two:

Mr. President, the financial crisis from which the country has just emerged, which culminated in a serious panic in October, was the most acute and destructive in its immediate consequences of any that has occurred in the history of the country. Nothing but the heroic measures taken by the representatives of the great business and financial interests of the country, acting in cooperation with the Secretary of the Treasury, prevented a total collapse of private credit and a disastrous destruction of all values. It is impossible to conceive, much less to measure, the losses which would have resulted from such a calamity. The country was saved by the narrowest possible margin from an overwhelming catastrophe whose blighting effect would have been felt in every household.

Who do you suppose said that? Mr. ALDRICH, the father of the Aldrich currency bill, in the Senate of the United States. Oh, yes; it is easy to see now what we tried to make you admit in 1893 and afterwards, that panics do come, and that they come periodically, but you denied it then, and you will not be permitted to plead it now in mitigation. There is a sentence in a very old book, "He that taketh the sword shall perish by the sword," and that is the predicament you are in this day. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You all indorse Cortelyou's great remedy for this panic. What was Cortelyou's remedy? The President sent him a letter of congratulation. It is a cold day when he does not send a letter to somebody, somewhere, about something. If he does not finally turn up with a bad case of pen paralysis, I miss my guess. [Laughter.] What was Cortelyou's plan? To issue a new batch of bonds in a time of profound peace, the identical thing for which you Republicans have pilloried a Democratic President for fifteen years. To this complexion has it come at last, that Republican morality, the morality of the great God-and-morality party, in the year of grace 1908, is this: If a Democratic President does a thing, it is wrong. If a Republican President does the same thing, it is right. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

That, too, when an irresistible moral wave is sweeping over the country from sea to sea. But, for fear somebody thinks I have overdrawn the size of this panic, I will read you a short excerpt from the speech of Governor Leslie M. Shaw, made night before last in Michigan:

Over 300,000 freight cars standing empty on the track; 8,000 locomotives out of commission; one-quarter of the population of several large cities idle, and, for the first time in a Republican Administration, free soup houses.

[Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Republican soup houses! [Laughter.] And yet the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], with banks breaking on every hand; with railroads, mills, factories, stores, and mines throwing men out of employment by the thousands; with laborers fleeing from the country by the tens of thousands for Europe; with suicides multiplying on every hand; with gov-

ernmental revenues constantly dwindling; with Republican soup houses springing up in great cities like mushrooms in a damp cellar, asks us to disbelieve the evidence of our own senses and say that the panic does not amount to much anyway.

Alexander Pope, one of the chief literary ornaments of Queen Anne's reign, which has been styled "the golden age of English literature," the friend of Swift, Addison, and Bolingbroke, a poet that is not read now nearly as much as he ought to be, in his Universal Prayer says:

That mercy I to others show,
That mercy show to me.

My Republican brethren, that is precisely what we are going to do to you. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] You might as well get ready for it. [Laughter.] You shall be held accountable for this panic, not only in this year, but through all the years that are to come. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

For fifteen long years you have lambasted us without mercy for the panic of 1893, which you accused us of producing. Now, we will lambast you without mercy for the panic of 1907, which you can not deny occurred in the eleventh year of the absolute supremacy of the Republican party. "Sweet is revenge!" And we will have our revenge on you now and in all future time. You can write that upon the tablets of your memory. You can not escape punishment any more than you can escape death itself.

It must be confessed, however, that if the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] fell down in his effort to minimize the Republican panic, he succeeded marvelously well in his threat to run his roller over those who oppose the President's recommendations, and to disfigure them. He got quick returns on that threat. While of course he does not aspire to infringe the Rooseveltian patent on "the big stick," Colonel HEPBURN wields a heavy bludgeon of his own and is not too tender about cudgeling recalcitrant Republicans with it. It will be remembered that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] in commenting on Colonel HEPBURN's threat, pointed out to him that in order to make good he must run his roller over the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN], and Mr. Speaker CANNON. That is quite a large contract, but Colonel HEPBURN has already accomplished part of his stunt by bringing into line the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and ex officio floor leader of the majority.

Lord Byron, a great poet and a fine judge of poetry, pronounces Wolfe's "Burial of Sir John Moore" to be the finest ballad in our language. One of the most striking stanzas in that ballad begins with the famous line, "But half of our heavy task was done." It may not be considered impertinent if I, in the spirit of friendship, remind the gentleman from Iowa that only one-fourth of his heavy task is done and seek to encourage him in the laudable duty he has set himself. Whenever he gets ready to run his roller over the gentleman from Pennsylvania and "Uncle Joe" and to disfigure them, I assure him, if he will give an advance notice, that he will have a huge audience, breathless with expectation and delirious with delight. [Laughter and applause.] There will be something doing on that occasion, and no mistake. Not since the Earl of Peterboro scaled the walls of Barcelona has a "stunt" so ambitious been essayed. [Laughter.]

Colonel HEPBURN has already earned the sobriquet of "Defender of the White House faith" by the valorous manner in which he defended the President from the lofty panegyric pronounced upon him by the brilliant orator from New York [Mr. COCKRAN]. He will prove himself somewhat of a crusader, if, single-handed, he undertakes to run his roller over the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] and Mr. Speaker CANNON and to disfigure them. If he succeeds, he will win unfading laurels and will deserve to snatch from Marshal Ney the title of "Bravest of the brave," bestowed in a moment of affection and gratitude by Napoleon. From his arduous and extrahazardous undertaking, I wish the gentleman from Iowa a safe deliverance.

Cæsar divides all Gaul into three parts. The speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is susceptible of the same treatment: One-third, delivered in tones that would make old Stentor turn green with envy, might be most appropriately marked "Public;" one-third, spoken in voice so low that only Republican Members could hear and with gestures suggestive of the Reverend Doctor Chadband's "Bless you, my children!" should be labeled "Private;" one-third, uttered in a whisper, apparently for the sole benefit and spiritual instruction of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] may be denominated "confidential." If there is any person about

this Capitol who is in sore need of abundant spiritual instruction as to the new Republican evangel of tariff revision, it is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

He is a fixed star of portentous magnitude in the constellation of the stand-patters. He is the stand-pat sheaf to which all other stand-pat sheaves do obeisance, even as Joseph saw things happen in his dream. He is to all other stand-patters what Aaron's rod was to the rods of the magicians. A verbatim copy of his thoughts while our Republican brother from Wisconsin [Mr. KÜSTERMANN] was delivering his great tariff-reform speech would make what Horace Greeley denominated "mighty interesting reading," and what Professor Squeers, of Dotheboys Hall, would have characterized as "richness." The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], having seen the light himself, does well to agonize with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], for it is written:

Joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth more than over ninety and nine just persons that need no repentance.

But he will be the last to yield—the last to repent. I imagine I see him now, all the rest of them deserting him, standing like James Fitzjames did in his duel with Roderick Dhu, and proclaiming—

Come one, come all! this rock shall fly
From its firm base as soon as I.

Yes, he needs the spiritual consolation and instruction by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]. Should the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], who is jealous of his mental integrity, ever arise in his place on this floor and unequivocally declare that he is earnestly in favor of general tariff revision downward, the angelic choir should break forth in full chorus:

Sound the loud timbrel, o'er land and o'er sea,
DALZELL is converted, the country is free!

[Prolonged laughter and applause.]

I wish to heaven that I could live till he does that. Then I would take away from Methuselah the honor of being the oldest man that ever lived. Methuselah would have to tarry several centuries at Jericho cultivating his beard in order to even enter the ring for old men. Hitherto and for some nineteen hundred years the conversion of Saul of Tarsus, as he journeyed from Jerusalem down to Damascus, has been taken and accepted as the ne plus ultra of the sudden and the unexpected; but the historian of our times will record the fact with iron pen upon his glowing page that the sudden and abrupt conversion of stand-patters to tariff revision in 1908 is the most astounding phenomenon of the phenomenal age in which we live.

I beg to suggest, however, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and other converts are somewhat enigmatical in the use of terms in making "the good confession." The gentleman from New York said inter alia: "I do not mind saying to-day that they (that is, the Republicans) will declare for a revision of the tariff," which remark was received with considerable applause on the Republican side. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that "revision of the tariff" and "tariff revision" are equivocal terms, and may mean revision up or revision down. So far as I know, no Republican member of the present Ways and Means Committee, except the scholarly gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL], has ever declared in favor of revising the tariff downward. He carries his nerve with him and has the courage of his convictions. But the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], who is an acknowledged expert on all military affairs, and who could give pointers in the art of war to Alexander, Hannibal, Caesar, or Napoleon, but who is decidedly inexpert in economic questions, let the cat out of the bag not long since by declaring that the Republicans would revise the tariff up or down, as they pleased. No doubt the Republicans are preparing for another stupendous confidence game on the people by declaring in their next platform for "tariff revision," without indicating whether the revision is to be up or down. They won in 1896 by a juggle on the financial question. Their solemn pledge to promote an international agreement for the free coinage of silver roped in enough silver Republicans to land William McKinley in the White House. Now they are meditating a juggle on the revision of the tariff as a companion piece to their successful juggle as to coinage.

No doubt we shall have another scientific case of paltering with the people in a double sense—of keeping the word of promise to the ear and breaking it to the hope.

That there are many Republicans—perhaps a third of all Republicans—honestly in favor of revising the tariff downward is beyond all question. If they are seduced by the equivocal promise of tariff revision, and, adhering to the regular Republican organization, enable it to win at the polls, only to find later on that the meaning placed upon the words

"tariff revision" by a Republican Congress and a Republican President is "revision up," they will find their situation accurately described in verses 43, 44, and 45 of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, which runs in this wise:

When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest, and findeth none.

Then he saith, I will return into my house from which I came out; and when he is come, he findeth it empty, swept, and garnished.

Then goeth he, and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there; and the last state of that man is worse than the first. Even so shall it be also unto this wicked generation.

Mr. KEIFER. What chapter?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The 12th chapter. You never would find it if I did not tell you where it is. [Prolonged laughter.]

The gentleman from New York also declares in favor of a "maximum and minimum tariff," a term as equivocal as is "tariff revision" or "revision of the tariff." Why did he not vouchsafe to us what his maximum and minimum are to be? Is he in favor of the plan proposed by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to make the minimum 80 per cent of the Dingley rates? Or is he in favor of the proposition of Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota, to make the Dingley rates the minimum and the maximum the blue vault of heaven? If the latter we would be repeating the condemned performance of jumping out of the frying pan into the fire. The gentleman from New York is a learned man and can be precise, when he chooses, in the use of words. I submit in all candor that because in both his propositions touching the tariff he used equivocal terms, one may fairly conclude that there is a large-sized Senegambian concealed in the wood pile, a mammoth rodent in the meal tub.

The gentleman's position seems to be this: Tariff revision and a maximum and minimum tariff should be brought about. The Republicans have had absolute control of all branches of the Government for eleven years and have left undone in this regard that which they ought to have done; but, if the people will only overlook past omissions and give them a new lease of power, they will revise the tariff either up or down and establish a maximum and minimum tariff with the Dingley rates for either the maximum or minimum, he isn't exactly certain which; and American voters are asked to go to the polls and buy these two tariff pigs in a poke.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] was hardly fair in his treatment of certain bills introduced by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. He seemed to think that the gentleman from Mississippi did not know that "white print paper" is a more comprehensive term than "white paper," which is preposterous, for whatever the gentleman from New York may think of the political opinions of the gentleman from Mississippi, he must admit that the latter is possessed of much erudition and is widely read not only in political literature, but in general literature—facts of which this House is proud. Writing "white paper" for "white print paper" was a slip of the pen—merely that, and nothing more. But suppose that the gentleman from Mississippi had actually proposed to put all "white paper" on the free list or to cut down the tariff thereon, what then? He would have been simply pushing a good thing a little further. The effort the gentleman put forth to make merry as to that small item shows to what sore straits the Republican floor leader is reduced in a tariff debate with the gentleman from Mississippi.

The gentleman from New York seems to be flatly opposed to removing the tariff on wood pulp and white print paper. He was kindly furnished by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] with a letter from the Census Bureau showing that prices for white print paper are getting lower instead of higher. We should not forget that a certain Commissioner of Labor, Hon. Carroll D. Wright, now president of a New England college, two or three years ago, to help the Republican campaign along, prepared lengthy tables of figures to show that the cost of living was lower then than in the years immediately preceding, when every housewife knew by sad experience that it was much higher. No doubt this year some Republican statistician will prove that times were better since September last than ever before in the entire history of the human race, thereby once more illustrating the proposition that while figures will not lie, liars will figure.

The gentleman from New York appears to think that the publishers of the land do not know what is the matter with themselves.

I have not time to-day to go into an argument about removing the tariff on wood pulp and print paper. I may do so at some future day; but one thing is certain, either the publishers of the land are a lot of consummate liars—which I do not believe—or the price of news paper has gone up and is higher than it

ought to be, for with almost unanimous voice, without regard to politics, they declare that the price is cruelly high and demand that wood pulp and news paper be put upon the free list. Republican papers have it in their power to drive Republicans here into giving them relief or to drive the Republicans out of Congress; and if they do not do the one thing or the other, they should forever hold their peace, for every Democrat here stands ready to vote for their relief. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] properly characterized the tariff on wood pulp and news paper and on art as a tax on intelligence, which should therefore be removed.

The gentleman from New York was muddled as to the bill of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to cut the tariff when above 100 per cent down to 100 per cent. He talked exclusively about tobacco and alcohol, on which there is a large internal-revenue tax. The history of that transaction is that in the Committee on Ways and Means Mr. WILLIAMS amended his bill so that where there was an internal-revenue tax on any article the tariff should be left high enough to compensate for the internal-revenue tax, even though the tariff on that article should be more than 100 per cent. As amended, it was voted down in committee, all the Democrats voting for it and all the Republicans voting against it. I have here a long list of articles on which the tariff is more than 100 per cent, in some cases much more. At some convenient season I will go into that matter in extenso.

Just one more thought about the tariff, and then I am through with that to-day. Some time during the session I will take a day off and make a sure-enough tariff speech.

Not long since my distinguished friend from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD], in a running-fire debate with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] about ship subsidies, wanted to know if it was not true that our shipping shrank more under free-trade legislation than under protective legislation. I take it that was a slip of the tongue. The gentleman from Maine is a great figure in this House. He understands the use of the English language, too, and he knows, none better, that there never has been a time that this country was under free-trade legislation under the Constitution, except a few days between Washington's inauguration and the enactment of the first tariff law. I submit that a man with the standing of the gentleman from Maine, one who speaks like the centurion of the Bible, with authority, and "saith to this one 'go,' and he goeth, and to another 'come,' and he cometh," has no right to use words in such a reckless manner as that. It may do for some obscure and ignorant brother, but will not do for the distinguished gentleman from Maine. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from New York twitted us with not having passed any legislation in the last forty years. I have very little money; that thing which he suggests has bothered me a long time; but I will give the gentleman a thousand dollars if he will tell me how a minority can outvote a majority in any legislative body on earth. [Laughter.] That is the problem we have all been working on here for years.

Republicans in this House will not be permitted to create the false impression that Republicans throughout the country are a unit in indorsing either the President's message or the President's conduct in his support of Mr. Secretary Taft in his White House aspirations. On the eastern border of Missouri is St. Louis, the great "City of the Iron Crown." There is published the *Globe-Democrat*, the Republican organ for eastern Missouri, southern Illinois, and adjoining territory. On February 1, closing a long and unfriendly editorial on the message, the *Globe-Democrat* says:

The general judgment with regard to this special message can hardly fail to be that it is ill-timed and ill-tempered. Nobody questions the President's motives or purposes, but, unfortunately, his methods are now and then such as to invite criticism from his friends and give comfort to his enemies.

That is the deliberate editorial judgment of the *Globe-Democrat*, the greatest Republican paper in the Mississippi Valley.

February 3 there appeared in the *Globe-Democrat* an editorial "squib" in these words:

There is a widespread belief that the world is steadily growing better and that business confidence, if it must be disturbed, should not be attacked in a fiery spirit.

The man must be dull indeed who does not see that that is an unfriendly charge against the President.

In the same column we find this paragraph, which needs a diagram to explain it:

"Go softly and carry a big stick" is a phrase that has attracted much attention. The advice contained in the first two words should not be slighted.

It seems to mean that the President is traveling at too rapid a gait and should use the soft pedal hereafter in making music for Republicans to dance to.

The *Globe-Democrat* is represented in this city by two bright

young men who, it may be reasonably assumed, are in full sympathy with the policies of that paper. On February 1 they sent a telegram to the *Globe-Democrat* which was printed with great black headlines in these words:

Message was prop to Taft, is opinion—Roosevelt's document only for partisan purpose, Republicans believe—Congress to ignore it—Telegrams from various points congratulate President—More messages expected.

The full text of the telegram is as follows:

WASHINGTON, February 1, 1908.

A strange and significant phase of present political conditions is found in the fact that no Republican of prominence in Congress has come forward with the declaration that President Roosevelt's special message of yesterday was written for any other than a partisan or personal purpose.

No credit is given to the President by his party's legislative leaders for motives aside from those of a political nature. While opinion continued to vary as to the circumstances which impelled Mr. Roosevelt to pen this most remarkable document, there seems to be general unanimity in the view that its object was to produce a marked effect upon the deliberations of the forthcoming national convention of the Republican party.

PLAN TO STRENGTHEN TAFT.

Yesterday the most common interpretation of the message among Senators and Representatives was that it revived the chance that the President would be renominated.

How that suggestion must cause the iron to enter the souls of certain ambitious Republican statesmen who pant for a residence in the White House even as the hart panteth for the water brooks!

The dispatch continues:

To-day there is not such general adherence to this idea. Having had twenty-four hours to think over Mr. Roosevelt's resentful production, and perhaps to have obtained a tip from the proper quarter, Republican Congressmen were inclined this afternoon and this evening to the opinion that the message was intended to strengthen Secretary Taft's candidacy and that it is bound to have that or the contrary effect of injuring him greatly.

However coldly the message was received by Republicans in Congress, hundreds of people away from Washington liked it so well that they sent telegrams of congratulation to the President. These helped to dry any dampener that may have been put on Mr. Roosevelt's spirits by his failure to awaken enthusiasm among his party's legislators, and he found additional cause of gratification in the kind words poured into his ears to-day by statesmen who found that duty demanded they call at the White House.

BOMBARDMENT MAY CONTINUE.

Some of the Republicans in Congress, particularly in the House, are much concerned over a suspicion that, unless Congress undertakes to enact some of the measures suggested in the President's special message, Mr. Roosevelt will bombard the Capitol with more messages of the same character in an attempt to arouse the people and bring from them a demand that the President's suggestion be adopted. Nothing has appeared, however, to justify any belief that Mr. Roosevelt has any such intention in view, or that there is warrant for a rumor that if Congress adjourns without putting more of the Roosevelt policies into the form of law, he will call an extra session.

The Congress leaders have determined upon a legislative programme which embraces very little work. Financial legislation is probable, and there is reason to believe that the employers' liability law, recently declared unconstitutional, will be reenacted in terms that will pass the scrutiny of the Supreme Court. The President, in his special message, urged that the law be reenacted, but it did not need his urging to make Congress take notice of this measure. Beyond these special features, not much legislative work outside of the necessary appropriation bills is contemplated, and in spite of the rumors that Mr. Roosevelt will insist that his views be placed on the statute books the Congress leaders are not giving any consideration to the question of abandoning their plan for an early adjournment.

So much for the *Globe-Democrat*.

On the western border of Missouri is Kansas City, in which is published the *Journal*, the Republican organ of western Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, and eastern Nebraska. In a recent issue it contained this racy editorial paragraph, which I cheerfully commend to all concerned:

The crack of the Administration whip has drowned all other sounds in Missouri, and the deadly menace of the "big stick" has overhung every Republican politician who has an office or who hopes to get one. Postmasters, district attorneys, marshals, revenue collectors, post-office inspectors, bank examiners, railway mail clerks, porters, keepers of cuspidors, and deputies of every kind and description in the Federal service, not to mention State committeemen, county committeemen, Congressional committeemen, and other more or less distinguished outs who hope to get a slice of Federal pie when it is cut next year, have joined in the Federal, if not national, anthem, "I'm a Taft man—beat me to it if you can," or words to that effect, chorally expressed.

I submit to a candid world that that is rather rough on a President who is a great civil-service reformer—on paper. I submit, furthermore, that if any Democrat in the land had written and published that, some limber-legged cuckoo would denounce him as a slanderer, and the President himself would have promptly clapped the offender into the Ananias Club; but the *Kansas City Journal* is a thoroughgoing Republican organ, and is in a fine position to talk back.

In St. Louis there is published the *Times*, an independent daily paper, with wide circulation, owned principally by Republicans of high degree. Recently it contained this editorial:

AFTER THREE DAYS.

Practically every carefully edited newspaper of prominence in the United States has sounded a note of regret in connection with the President's message. There seems to be no dissent from the proposition

that Mr. Roosevelt's utterance was intemperate and unnecessary. Even the strongly partisan Republican papers have commented severely on the language employed in the latest utterance from the White House.

There is agreement on the point that the President has injured the cause of Secretary Taft. Certain of the President's supporters have reached the hasty conclusion that Mr. Roosevelt has decided to force his own renomination; but anyone who has read his various letters and statements on the subject can not with seriousness entertain such an idea.

It would appear that Mr. Roosevelt, acting in angry haste, has impulsively voiced his sentiments. In doing so he has hurt his cause and that of Mr. Taft. He has not injured the country, a fact proved by the indifference of business and its failure to respond in any way to the tirade officially sent to Congress last Friday.

These excerpts from Missouri press are straws showing how the President's message and the President's conduct are regarded by the faithful in that magnificent Commonwealth.

February 6, seven days after the event, the Washington correspondent of the Philadelphia Inquirer, a thick-and-thin Republican organ, edited with great ability, sent his paper the following illuminating dispatch:

CONGRESS LIKELY TO ADJOURN EARLY DESPITE MESSAGE—ROOSEVELT'S RECOMMENDATIONS WILL PROBABLY BE IGNORED—WILL NOT BE DRIVEN BY THE BIG STICK.

INQUIRER BUREAU, POST BUILDING,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1908.

An extremely early adjournment of Congress is now the talk about the Capitol. Gossip about the House corridors and cloakrooms is that the adjournment of the session will be some time between the middle of April and May 1. This would be an unusually early date for the close of a long session of Congress, but the leaders are anxious not to remain here a day longer than necessary.

Members of Congress want to be home to get ready for elections, for one thing; and, besides, this thing of trying to legislate calmly under the shadow of the big stick is disconcerting, and leads to nervousness. Since the President's message was sent to Congress there has been a great deal of talk that the Senate and House would hasten to enact the legislation the President is urging. It does not appear likely the House and Senate Republican leaders will, to any great extent, upset the plans they made at the outset of the session. These plans comprehended the passage of the appropriation bills, with a very limited number of general bills of importance, and with most of the President's recommendations fallen by the wayside.

BIG STICK NOT EFFECTIVE.

It does not seem likely the House and Senate leaders will permit themselves to be driven by the White House and clubbed into passing legislation to which they are hostile. This does not comport with the methods of men who practically control the course of things at the Capitol. The fact that an extremely early adjournment is being talked of is the best possible indication that the leaders are not calculating seriously on going into most of the subjects the President wants legislation upon. For instance, if Congress contemplated careful legislation for Federal control of corporations or Federal supervision of the issues of railroad securities, it is certain that the session would be prolonged until at least early in June. It would take weeks to dispose of matters of this kind in both Houses. It is to be recalled, too, that the currency question has yet to be threshed out in both Houses, and that a number of weeks will be taken up with this.

The seventh column of the editorial page of the Washington Post, independent, is usually devoted to interviews with distinguished visitors to the finest capital in the world. That column is an interesting feature of an interesting paper. We all read it to see if our names are written there and to try and discover what public sentiment is, for of all places Washington is the poorest view point of the political field. Here molehills are magnified into mountains and mountains are minified into molehills. Consequently those who desire to really know what is going on in the country at large read carefully and ponder prayerfully the interviews with visitors fresh from contact with the great body of the people.

Recently Hon. John C. Houk, from Knoxville, Tenn., with whom many of us served in Congress, whose father before him served many years, was in Washington, and he unbosomed himself to a Post correspondent. In the aforementioned column, on the 7th day of February, appeared an interview with him in words and figures as follows, to wit:

John C. Houk, Republican, of Tennessee, who served the Knoxville district in the Fifty-second and Fifty-third Congresses and who has frequently been a member of the State legislature, is at the Raleigh for a few days. He is the original Roosevelt man in Tennessee, and did some important work for the President. He still supports the President, and is friendly to Secretary Taft, but last night, in talking Tennessee politics, he said it was time somebody told the War Secretary how matters stood.

"The Republican party, especially in the South, will never be worth anything unless it is built upon something besides Federal offices," said Mr. Houk. "We would to-day have a Republican State administration in Tennessee but for patronage."

"By impudent interference with the rights of others and infraction of law for many years, a cabal of Federal officeholders in Tennessee has disgraced national Republican administrations; and I believe I conservatively state the case when I say that to-day there are more violations of the civil-service laws and of the spirit of civil-service reform by Federal officeholders in the South, and certainly in Tennessee, than at any time during the past generation. Conditions are worse than under Grant's Administration, when, of course, the civil-service act of 1883, and amendment thereto, were not in existence."

"When a campaign is on, inspectors or special agents are sent to the South to intimidate officeholders. In 1896 there were 196 inspectors or special agents, whose annual compensation was \$1,300,000. In 1907 there were 3,000 inspectors or special agents, drawing \$9,000,000 annually."

"These agents slip down among us with the muck rake in one hand

for the citizen complaining of the violation of law on the part of the officeholder and a brush full of whitewash in the other hand for the offending officeholders. I speak as the friend of the present Administration, and I believe if the President knew conditions in the South he would correct them."

"We understand in Tennessee that a high public official at Washington, who never lived in Tennessee, has for months been laying wires to drive the 150,000 Republicans in my State into submitting practically to the selection of delegates to the national convention by the Federal officeholders. We shall not submit to such dictation, and that high functionary should be dismissed from the Administration."

"If Federal officeholders in Tennessee had obeyed the law, Judge Taft would have got the vote of that State in the convention without the least trouble; but now it seems that these officeholders are certain to cause double delegations from my State."

I could fill 100 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with such Republican clippings; but to do so would be wasteful and ridiculous excess, as most of you have read scores of similar tenor. It will be observed that I have quoted none of the bitter diatribes against the President, such as have appeared in the New York Sun and certain other Republican papers. I have quoted a few Republican papers which criticize and oppose him with some approximation to moderation and which may be taken and accepted as representing Republican opinion.

Here, however, is an extract from an Administration paper—the Boston Transcript—which is such a perfect gem of literature that it deserves a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which my excellent friend from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON] characterizes as "the greatest daily published in the wide, wide world." Recently a staff correspondent of the Transcript illumined its columns with this exquisite paragraph:

The President is not using Federal patronage in any vulgar, commercial sense, or anything of the kind. He remains the high-minded man we have always known him to be. But he is using his influence as Theodore Roosevelt, persistently and mightily, for the nomination of William H. Taft, and this same Theodore Roosevelt happens to be the President of the United States, and so at the head of the greatest army of appointive officers that exists under the light of the sun. The stronger the Rooseveltite in the Cabinet or elsewhere in the public service, the greater his enthusiasm for Taft. All along the line, from the wood choppers in Government reservations to the Cabinet ministers whose political future is staked in the Roosevelt line, present and prospective, the Roosevelt men are for Taft.

These Republican criticisms and grumbings are not mere empty words and frothy mouthings. They are being transmuted into action—action hostile to the President, meant to defeat his heart's desire of bequeathing his Presidential mantle to Mr. Secretary Taft—for every gale that sweeps from the South and North and East and West brings to our ears the clash of resounding arms among the Republican factions, and to Democratic ears it is sweeter music than any symphony that Beethoven ever produced. Three hundred contesting delegates is the estimate of the newspapers. Florida Republican factionists answer Ohio factionists; Missouri Republican factionists answer New York factionists, and from ocean to ocean among Republican factionists it is war to the knife and the knife to the hilt. More power to their arms is my sincere and fervent prayer! As they stick and thrust and cut each other, Democrats cheer them on by impartially shouting: "Go it, husband! Go it, bear!"

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] both took a fall out of Thomas Jefferson. [Laughter.] It amuses them and does not do Thomas Jefferson any harm. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] I wish to suggest to those two worthy statesmen that they read a little speech that Senator George Frisbie Hoar made about Thomas Jefferson. One sentence is, "He comes down to us with the Declaration of Independence in one hand the Louisiana Purchase in the other." [Applause on the Democratic side.] Nobler eulogy no man hath, and the statesmen of the present day can not damage him by assailing his memory. The gentleman from New York gets history all mixed up about Jefferson. He said that Hamilton made this a nation and that Jefferson denounced the Constitution as a mere rope of sand. Why, bless your souls, the two favorite expressions that Alexander Hamilton always used about the Constitution of the United States were, "a mere rope of sand," and "a weak and worthless fabric." They were not Jefferson's expressions at all. As late as February 27, 1802—a little more than two years before his tragic death at Weehawken—on which bloody field James Parton says that both Burr and Hamilton fell—Hamilton said in a letter to Gouverneur Morris:

Mine is an odd destiny. Perhaps no man in the United States has sacrificed or done more for the present Constitution than myself; and, contrary to all my anticipations of its fate, as you know, from the very beginning, I am still laboring to prop the frail and worthless fabric. Yet I have the murmur of its friends no less than the curses of its foes for my reward. What can I do better than withdraw from the scene? Every day proves to me more and more that this American world was not made for me.

There you have it. "A weak and worthless fabric." "What is writ is writ," and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] shall not be permitted at this late day to make a nunc

pro tunc entry for his illustrious client. Hamilton and Morris were bosom cronies. Morris was one of his most faithful friends in life and his most eloquent eulogist in death.

This letter was the honest outpouring of a sore and wounded heart to a friendly ear, and no doubt expresses Hamilton's sincere opinion of the Constitution after it had been in operation thirteen years and when almost everybody else recognized it as a glorious success.

I call particular attention to the last sentence in that extract, "Every day proves to me more and more that the American world was not made for me." There spoke the real Hamilton, without hedging and without disguise. There never was a moment in his life when he did not distrust man's capacity for self-government and did not dread "the reign of the common people." [Applause on the Democratic side.] On the other hand, Thomas Jefferson believed in the common people [applause]; loved them with all the intensity of his great heart; wrought nobly for them, and they have repaid his love in Scripture measure—heaped up, pressed down, and running over.

In the speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] occurs this amazing sentence. If Isaac Disraeli, father of the brilliant Benjamin, Earl of Beaconsfield, had ever fixed his eyes on this sentence he would have clapped it into his *Curiosities of Literature*. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is a learned man. He can use the English language with accuracy when he so desires. I want you to listen to this sentence now with critical ear:

But Alexander Hamilton, perhaps at a dinner at which Mr. Jefferson was present—

At a dinner, mark you—
incorporated into the Constitution and into the laws—

Mark you, at a dinner—
that the debts which the States incurred for bringing liberty and victory to the Federal arms should be assumed by the Federal Government—that the National Government should be responsible for the national defense—and thereby wrote into the Constitution and the laws—

At a dinner, mark you—
the fact that we are a nation—
which wonderful sentence was received with applause on the Republican side.

Lest we forget, I once more remind you that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] thinks that Alexander Hamilton, "solitary and alone"—to use Col. Thomas Hart Benton's pleonastic phrase on a memorable occasion—amended the Constitution and laws in a most important manner at a dinner! If he could accomplish all that at a dinner, what, in Heaven's name, would he have done if he had also worked at it at breakfast and at supper? [Laughter.] But the truth is that there is not a word in the Constitution, whether it was put there at dinner or any other time, about the assumption of the State's Revolutionary debts by the Federal Government. It is a matter of statute. That is all there is to that.

Some of these days, with the consent of the House, I intend to make an entire speech here about Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson, as a duty to the living and to the dead. [Applause on the Democratic side.] For the present I will content myself with this statement as to that pair of Titans.

The conspiracy, for it is nothing less, and the chief proponent of it is Hon. Elihu Root, Secretary of State, to pose Alexander Hamilton as "the father of the Constitution," is one of the most preposterous and impudent fakes in history. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I know how it will work. It is the New England school of book writers that does it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Somebody hints it and then somebody declares it, and the next you know it is clapped into the school-books. That title, "the father of the Constitution," belongs of right to James Madison, the great Virginian. [Applause on the Democratic side.] These latter-day Hamiltonians are endeavoring to filch from James Madison the glory of being "the father of the Constitution," just as Americus Vesputius filched from the great Genoese navigator the glory of fixing his name on a newly discovered world. The facts of history are plain. James Madison went to the Constitutional Convention with a plan of a constitution in his pocket.

It was submitted to the Virginia delegation, with George Washington at its head. They agreed to it and presented it as "the Virginia plan." Hamilton had a plan and somebody else had a plan, and the convention rejected Hamilton's plan, they also rejected the third plan, and they adopted Madison's plan in all of its essential features, and he has been acclaimed "the father of the Constitution" until quite recently.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield twenty minutes

more, or such time as the gentleman desires in which to complete his speech.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the House, and I will not abuse the privilege. If the spirits of the illustrious dead take any interest in the affairs of this mundane sphere, Alexander Hamilton's spirit must be in a state of perpetual hilarity on account of the antics of his disciples to make him "the father of the Constitution," a document which he always denounced as "a mere rope of sand" and "a weak and worthless fabric."

I have never been enamored of Hamilton's political theories, but candor compels the statement that he did yeoman service with his pen in the *Federalist* and with his tongue in the convention of New York to have the Constitution adopted. This mighty man needs no borrowed glory to make him one of the colossal figures in our history, for time and distance have only magnified his proportions, as they have also those of his immortal antagonist, Thomas Jefferson, who overthrew and destroyed the party which Hamilton had created. They were antagonists in their lives; they are antagonists in history; antagonists even in their graves.

It is said that the test of the pudding is chewing the string. [Laughter.] The test of sincerity here as to who is more in favor of any good laws which the President has suggested in his various messages is to be found much more in vote than in word. That is the genuine test of sincerity here. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], together with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY], are the real leaders on the Republican side of this House, under the general supervision of the Speaker. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

They are the ruling elders. They constitute the "big five" on the Republican side of this House. These five men, by being able to catch the Speaker's eye at any time, can force any measure through this House that they want. In thirteen years' service I have never seen the Republican machine thoroughly upset and run over in this House except on one occasion, and that was when the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] broke away from the Republican majority and led that flying wedge of Republican insurgents down this aisle, when the Democrats, with the gallantry of the French at Fontenoy, stood aside and let them go through the tellers first. [Laughter.] That was a great day; but the gentleman from Minnesota is now "back on the reservation." [Laughter.] I think that that day's bolt was the performance which more than all else led him finally to the chairmanship of the Committee on Appropriations. [Laughter.] He is one of the "big five," and all of them, as I have said, enjoy peculiar facilities in catching the Speaker's eye. [Laughter.] When one of that "big five" arises in his place and says, "Mr. Speaker," the Speaker does not fire back at him that crushing interrogatory, "For what purpose does the gentleman rise?" [laughter] for the all-sufficient reason that he knows in advance for what purpose the gentleman rises. [Renewed laughter.]

If, in an unexpected emergency, he does not know precisely what any one of the "big five" is up to, he has sufficient confidence in his sagacity and in his fidelity to the machine to take it for granted that whatever is proposed is for the good of the Republican order. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Consequently recognition is granted immediately and ungrudgingly.

I suggest, if you gentlemen want to prove your sincerity, I will tell you exactly how to do it now in about two minutes. Let one of the "big five" arise in his place and ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a new employers' liability bill. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Every Democrat will gladly give his consent, and in thirty minutes by the town clock the bill will be passed, carrying gladness to the heart of every wage-earner betwixt the two oceans. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. I noticed, the other day, that the gentleman's authority to speak for his party was questioned by one gentleman from New Jersey. Has the gentleman canvassed his party so thoroughly now that he knows that he is speaking for the entire party?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will tell you how that is: A few of the boys are off the reservation, but they are coming in very rapidly, one by one, as sure as you are living. I am sorry you interrupted me in such an interesting place. [Laughter.] Let

the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN], one of the "big five," and the slickest one of the five at that [prolonged laughter], let him ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a bill limiting the Federal courts in issuing injunctions—such as the Clayton bill, for instance—and it will go through like it was greased, as far as the Democrats are concerned. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let still another of the "big five" ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a bill providing for jury trials in contempt cases by construction, such as the Henry bill, and, so far as we are concerned, we will give you not only consent to consider it, but every Democratic vote to pass it. [Applause.]

Let still another of the "big five" ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a bill providing for the publication of campaign contributions and the names of campaign contributors, such as the Rucker bill, or the Cockran bill, and we on this side will hail it with rapture and pass it with a whoop. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let the biggest of the "big five," the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], arise in his place and ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a bill to put wood pulp and print paper on the free list, such as a dozen of us have introduced, and no Democrat will object. [Applause on the Democratic side.] On the contrary, we will be happy to record every Democratic vote in its favor, and the publishers of the land, with one accord, will rise up and call us blessed. That's an easy and certain test of sincerity. How do you Republican statesmen like that programme?

All five of these bills can be passed in one day, provided the "big five" can induce barely twenty-eight Republicans to vote for them; for twenty-eight Republicans, with the solid Democratic vote, constitute a majority of this House; and surely there are twenty-eight righteous men in this Republican Sodom. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

My Republican brethren, you have the power and you should have the disposition to enact into law such bills as I have named. You can not shirk or shift the responsibility for you have the machinery in your hands. Adjourn without such legislation, and yours will be the condemnation.

On the morning of far-famed Trafalgar, Nelson signaled his fleet: "This day England expects every man to do his duty." When the sun set on that stupendous day the Union Jack waved in triumph over a crimson ocean, and Horatio Nelson's name was written at the very top of the scanty list of the world's great sea kings.

My Democratic brothers, a greater battle than Trafalgar is here, involving more and vaster interests, fraught with more far-reaching and more momentous consequences. In the impending conflict I summon every Democrat in all this broad land to service under the Democratic banner and for Democratic principles; principles which were enunciated by the immortal Jefferson, which were upheld by the heroic Jackson, and which are as dear to the hearts of the people to-day as they were a century ago. Fighting under that banner and for those principles we won fourteen Presidential elections out of thirty. We can win again and again upon them, until we drive the Republicans from every place of power, thereby restoring the Government to the wise, sane, wholesome, patriotic principles of the fathers—a consummation devoutly to be wished. [Prolonged applause.]

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and, the Speaker having resumed the chair, sundry messages, in writing, from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. LATTA, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On February 11, 1908:

H. R. 558. An act to extend to the port of Chattanooga, Tenn., the privileges of immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement;

H. R. 9217. An act amending sections 2533 and 2534 of Revised Statutes so as to change the name of the Fairfield collection district; and

H. R. 14011. An act amending an act approved June 10, 1880, entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes."

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield one hour to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TIRRELL].

Mr. TIRRELL. Mr. Chairman, after the witty, humorous, and literary address to which we have just listened, so de-

lightful to all of us, whether we agree with the views advanced or not, it is like unto a descent to Avernus for anyone to have the temerity to address this House upon a dry subject calculated to empty the House before he has proceeded far upon his way. Yet perhaps I am justified to a certain extent in doing this, because the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has himself in the course of his address twice alluded to the subject upon which I propose to speak this afternoon. He called the attention of the committee to the remark of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] in referring to the tariff upon wood pulp and paper, and then almost at the close of his address he brought up an illustration of how eagerly this House would vote, without dragging the slow hours along, for the immediate passage of a bill, if one of the "big five" would introduce it, which would place wood pulp upon the free list. I believe the remarks of the gentleman were that there were some twelve bills of that character now pending before this body, and that the matter is exciting more or less interest is undoubted. Yet, strange as it may appear, although this matter has, in my judgment, excited more interest and comment during the past year than any other article upon the tariff schedule, we have up to this time failed, as far as I can learn by reading the comments in the newspapers or by the addresses on this floor, to ascertain one single reason why it should be done. No facts, no data have been given. It seems to have been assumed as a self-evident proposition. Therefore, inasmuch as I myself, as trustee of an estate and a director in one of the large pulp companies of this country, have a certain personal interest in the matter, it seems to me my duty to exploit the subject.

It is well known that during the last few months the American Publishers' Association and the Editorial Association have been in Washington and have laid their grievances before the President of the United States. They demanded, as our Democratic friends are demanding, that the tariff on pulp should be removed. They expected, from intimations that they had heard, that the President would favor that proposition. Much to their astonishment, when his annual message was read before this Congress when it first convened, instead of recommending what they had demanded, he recommended something entirely different, and a measure, which I shall endeavor to show before I finish my remarks, is more drastic than the law as it now exists, because his recommendation was that the duty should be taken off wood pulp, but there should be entered into an agreement with the Dominion of Canada that there should be no export duties placed upon pulp logs by the Canadian Parliament, a proposition going much further than the existing law, as I shall proceed to show. In the last gubernatorial campaign in Massachusetts the Democratic candidate for governor formulated his own platform. That platform was made up of four planks—free hides, free coal, free wood pulp, and free timber. He said it was a referendum to the electors of Massachusetts, that they, by electing him on that platform which he himself had formulated, would demonstrate to the country that not only was Massachusetts eager for tariff revision, but that they were eager for tariff revision along the lines he had laid down. I read every speech of that candidate as it appeared in the metropolitan journals of Boston, and I assert to you honestly and squarely that I never saw one single reason advanced in any speeches which that candidate made why the duty should be removed upon wood pulp. He seemed either to assume, as everybody else who has discussed this question seems to have assumed, that it was a self-evident proposition, or else if they did look into the matter they were confronted with such insuperable objections that they did not dare advance the argument before the people.

Now, in order that this may properly be understood it is necessary that I should in a sort of academic way state how paper is made. This may seem to be a matter of supererogation, and yet you can not understand the paper business and the pulp business unless you know how paper and pulp are made. Pulp is made out of the fiber of wood. There is nothing in paper, except coloring matter, but wood. There is nothing but wood in the paper which I hold before you. This paper reduced to fiber by a mechanical process in placed in an immense tank of water, and then the fiber is taken off by a paper machine, on a cloth which revolves about rollers until it comes out a sheet, and to come out a sheet, which is absolutely indispensable, it is necessary that the fiber should be matted together, should hold together. The only wood thus far found, even under the inventive genius of the American people, whose fiber is sufficiently long and strong and of the proper color to mat together and make news paper, is spruce. You can make paper out of cottonwood and hemlock and pine. You can make it out of cornstalks, but you can not make it so that it will sell, because

under the present machinery and processes by which paper is made you have got to have a long, strong, tenacious fiber, and the only wood that is known which produces that fiber is spruce wood. Now, in making news paper the sap is not taken out of the fiber. Therefore, when that fiber is matted together it has all the moisture in it. If you should take a newspaper like the Washington Post or any other paper issued in this city to-day and take your pen and ink and write upon it, you would find that the ink spreads; and that is because the sap in the fiber is still there. The result of this is, the sap being in the fiber of the news paper, there is always more or less moisture, so that you can not write on it, so that you can easily tear it apart. It seems to be rotten, but that rottenness is only apparent, it is simply the ease of separation by reason of the sap being in the fiber that you can tear it apart. Therefore, it is absolutely indispensable that you get a fiber that will hold together because the sap is in it, and the only fiber that can be found to be used among the mills of the Northern States is spruce.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Where is that spruce found?

Mr. TIRRELL. I am coming to that. Spruce wood is found in Maine, New Hampshire, a little in Vermont, in New York, in Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and considerable quantities in West Virginia. There is still a very large supply in the State of Maine. There is a considerable quantity in New Hampshire, but inasmuch as it is proposed at a no distant day to make a forest reservation in the northern part of New Hampshire, and as that reservation will take out 600,000 acres, there will not be spruce enough left to run the great mill at Berlin in that State without getting pulp and logs from Canada.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How large are the trees, and how long does it take them to grow?

Mr. TIRRELL. The trees that they grind up are, on an average, about 5 to 8 or 9 inches in diameter.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How old is a tree of that size?

Mr. TIRRELL. I can not say, but spruce is a fairly rapid grower. I should think it would take about forty years to get a good-sized growth of spruce. Perhaps the gentleman from Maine can tell you.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I think the gentleman is a little extreme, I should say between thirty and forty years; but of course that depends a good deal upon what you call the average growth—on the diameter of the tree.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. TIRRELL. Certainly.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I have heard the statement made many times as to how large a space of territory in the way of acres of ordinary spruce timber is required to issue one of the Sunday editions of the large papers like the New York American. The gentleman from Massachusetts is always accurate, and I wish he would state, if he knows, in regard to that.

Mr. TIRRELL. I can not say. I have seen the same statement that the gentleman has seen, that it took a territory of 10 or 12 acres.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Does the gentleman think that is possible?

Mr. TIRRELL. I do not. I have never seen it figured out.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Can the gentleman tell us how long it will be before we have no spruce to use at the rate that we are now cutting it?

Mr. TIRRELL. I am coming to that, and I will try to give the gentleman information on that point.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Let me ask the gentleman a question. Is the gentleman advised as to the relative draft upon the forests of the country for the pulp and paper industry as compared with all other timber and lumber products?

Mr. TIRRELL. About 5 per cent is used for pulp.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I think the gentleman is in excess of the actual draft. The present draft of the pulp and paper industry, as compared with the total consumption—and that includes lumber, timber, firewood, fences, etc.—is only 1.78 per cent. Those are the figures given to me by the Forestry Bureau.

Mr. TIRRELL. I took my statement from the newspapers.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I have taken mine directly from the Bureau of Forestry.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Before the gentleman concludes his remarks, I wish he would explain about what is known as the "paper trust," and what the result has been in the litigation of the Federal Government against it?

Mr. TIRRELL. The gentleman refers to the General Paper Company which is located in the western part of the country along the line of the Mississippi River. I am not conversant with that matter, although I have among my papers here a list of all the companies that were involved in that trust. That trust was organized from these companies forming the General Paper Company, which did all their selling—an illegal trans-

action broken up by the Government. As to the particulars of that I am unable to state.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman said it was broken up by the Government. I hope it has been broken up, but my information is that there was entered a consent decree enjoining it, and that it is now disobeying it, and hence the recommendation of the President.

Mr. TIRRELL. I was speaking about the subject of spruce in New York. More than one-half of the news paper of this country is made in the State of New York, and I will say to the gentleman, in addition, that the increase in the manufacture of paper has been so wonderful, indeed marvelous, in this country since 1870 that the United States is now making more paper—almost as much paper as the rest of the civilized world.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Print paper?

Mr. TIRRELL. Yes. In New York the State has prohibited the cutting of timber of any kind for twenty years over a territory covering 4,000 square miles. There are 3,588,803 acres of available spruce timber lands in New York. But the Adirondack Park reservation contains 2,807,760 acres of this, leaving 781,760 acres only for pulp supplies. Now, when we get to Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, we find there that spruce wood has become very largely denuded, and they are absolutely obliged to run their paper mills in those States by receiving their supply of paper from the Province of Quebec. They have been very wasteful, apparently, in the natural supply in their own country, but whether wasteful or not, those great mills are now dependent upon a foreign country to keep the mills going. I speak of these things in order to come to the most important, and really the only important, consideration in connection with the tariff on wood pulp. There were 2,800,000 cords of spruce wood from the United States used last year in making pulp.

There was obtained from Canada 736,000 cords, according to the official returns, but according to the estimates made in Canada, from 800,000 to 1,000,000 cords of pulp logs were exported to this country, necessary to keep our mills going; and the importance of maintaining our hold in order to secure wood to manufacture paper from was so great that paper manufacturers, than whom there are no more alert, far-sighted, and prophetic business men in the country, early saw that in order to conserve the spruce supply of the United States, not destroying small timber, but only cutting it out as it ought to be done, so that the forest would replace itself, they must have supplies from the other side of the border on which to draw, not wholly, but only partly, so that they could properly cut down the spruce on the timber lands which they own, located in the United States, to supply the necessary deficiencies from the timber exports from the Province of Quebec. The importance of the tariff, therefore, in regard to the maintenance of this great industry in our country—and there are 108 paper and pulp mills in the State of New York alone, and New York is dependent to run these mills upon the spruce which they receive from the Dominion of Canada, and will become more and more so as the years pass by—in order to maintain those mills, to keep those mills going, it was not necessary to have a little picayune tariff of 15 per cent. That does not amount to anything; that is only one-third of the average tariff rates of the Dingley bill. There is not a paper mill in the United States but what could successfully maintain its competition with the Canadian mills if that little tariff of 15 per cent was the only consideration. Our paper sells higher and is better than any paper made on the other side of the line. We get better prices for it in England and on the Continent than they can get for Canadian paper, because it is better made and of higher quality, and the paper manufacturers of the United States, if that was the only thing connected with the tariff, would come in here and request with all celerity and, as the eloquent gentleman from Missouri said, let any of these bills engineered by the "big five" go into immediate enactment.

The little joker, as the gentleman from Wisconsin said the other day about the Standard Oil tariff, the little joker to the tariff of 15 per cent, is what is needed and what has preserved this industry in our country. I commend the wisdom of those who framed the Dingley Act, who saw with prophetic vision what the future was likely to be in regard to this industry, not in raising the tariff upon pulp, which they did not do because the tariff there is the same under the Wilson law, and the tariff upon paper and pulp has been in existence ever since the organization of the Government, as appears by statement which I herewith submit for consideration:

Act of July 4, 1789, all paper, 7½ per cent.

Act of August 10, 1790, printing paper, 10 per cent.

Act of May 22, 1824, printing paper, 10 cents per pound.

Act of August 30, 1842, printing paper, 10 cents per pound.

Act of July 30, 1846, printing paper, 30 per cent ad valorem.
 Act of March 3, 1863, printing paper, 20 per cent ad valorem.
 Act of March 3, 1883, printing paper, sized, 20 per cent ad valorem.
 Act of March 3, 1883, printing paper, unsized, 15 per cent ad valorem.
 Act of October 1, 1890 (McKinley), printing paper, sized, 20 per cent ad valorem.
 Act of October 1, 1890 (McKinley), printing paper, unsized, 15 per cent ad valorem.
 Act of August 27, 1894 (Wilson), printing paper, sized, 15 per cent ad valorem.
 Act of July 24, 1897 (Dingley), printing paper, value not over 2 cents, three-tenths cent per pound = 15 per cent = \$6 per ton.
 Act of July 24, 1897 (Dingley), printing paper, value not over 2½ cents, four-tenths cent per pound.

Indeed, under some tariff acts, in the early part of the last century, the tariff was 10 cents per pound.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What is it now?

Mr. TIRRELL. Reduced to an ad valorem basis, which is the only way by which a person can understand it, it is 15 per cent on the price of the article; and it has never been any lower in the whole history of the country than it is to-day, at least not enough to take any account of. But they attached this provision to that tariff so that in case Canada should impose an export duty upon logs, by what is known as a "countervailing duty" our Government could impose an equal duty upon any pulp or paper if they attempted to import or sell it in this country. That, gentlemen, as I now shall endeavor to show, has been the sole salvation of the paper mills of New York, and, if continued, will be the salvation of the paper mills of the country in the years to come. In Canada, if anywhere in the world, is the inexhaustible supply. In Ontario alone the pulp area is 80,000 square miles, or approximately 51,000,000 acres, to say nothing of greater areas still in Quebec, Labrador, and the great Northwest.

Mr. BONYNGE. Is there any tariff on the spruce wood?

Mr. TIRRELL. No.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How would the export tax affect the value of the log on this side?

Mr. TIRRELL. Logs are admitted free. There is no export duty. I will now proceed and inform the gentlemen and the House what the condition is that is confronting us in regard to this great industry. And, gentlemen, right upon that point I want to give you a few figures as to the extent of it. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] told me a few minutes ago that one-third of all the capital in that great State which was invested in manufacturing enterprises was invested in the paper and pulp industry. The product of the pulp and paper mills of this country amounts to over \$200,000,000. There are \$300,000,000 of invested capital, and \$32,000,000 yearly paid in wages.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, on that question of the cost of Canadian wood as compared with domestic wood, I submit for the consideration of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TIRRELL] that the Canadian wood to-day, when it is purchased in the Canadas and imported to the United States and into the State of Maine, costs at the mill from \$1 to \$2 a cord more than the domestic would cost without any tariff. And within the last ten days there has been a resolution brought up in the Canadian Parliament for the establishment of an export duty on pulp wood, so that it would add \$1 or \$2.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Is that because it is better wood?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. It is simply because the people in Maine are using up their domestic supply quite rapidly, and they want to preserve it, and under existing conditions they are able to pay this export price in order to save their own wood that is now growing in the forests.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Is it true that there are any of them so philanthropic that they will pay a dollar or two more a cord for the wood than they would for the Maine wood?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. It is not a question of philanthropy. About 22 per cent of the consumption of the Maine mills comes from the Canadas. They buy it and pay that extra price for the purpose of conserving their own supply.

Mr. TIRRELL. Now, I was upon this point. Under our Constitution there can be no export duties imposed, and your cotton and wheat and corn go out free, but it is not so in the Dominion of Canada. Under their system of procedure and laws they can not only impose export duties, but they can really prohibit their raw material from going out of the country. I wish to show you just exactly what they are doing and how they feel upon this matter, and the danger to American industries. The largest manufacturer of paper and pulp in Canada is William Van Horne. Most of you, and I presume all of you, have heard of him. He is one of the captains of industry in Canada and one of the great men of the Dominion. He is the president of the largest pulp and paper mill in Canada. He can manufacture 52,000 tons of paper a year, and Canada only uses 27,000 tons. The surplus he is sending to England and

Australia, and some of it to this country. Now, I want you to know exactly what Mr. William Van Horne has to say in regard to the policy which should be enforced as to the exportation of pulp wood to this country. He says:

Let us cut off the supply of pulp wood from the American mills. Then in six months you will find American capitalists erecting paper mills in Canada.

I am going to give you a few quotations. I have a large number of them, but I will not weary you too long by this one line of thought in connection with this matter.

W. H. Rowley, a prominent Canadian, on December 5 last, before the Canadian Manufacturing Association, said:

The imposition of a substantial export duty on pulp wood would make Canada the world's mistress in this industry.

E. N. Lewis, a member of Parliament, gave notice on the 20th day of January of this year to the Canadian Parliament, as follows:

That in the opinion of this House such an export duty should be placed on pulp wood that will induce its manufacture into paper in this country, and thus save to the labor of Canada the \$6,000,000 now lost.

Last month there was also a delegation, headed by a representative of the Toronto Globe, who came to Ottawa and were lobbying in the Parliament there to have either a prohibitive or export duty placed on logs. It is currently reported that to bribe the newspapers of Canada these men, the representatives of the pulp and paper manufacturers of the Dominion, agreed to enter into a contract for a long term of years with newspaper publishers, if the press will favor this movement, at a far less price than paper is selling for at the present time.

It shows the persistent determination of the pulp and paper manufacturers of the Dominion to obtain an absolute monopoly of this business.

J. D. Holland, of the St. Jerome Paper Company and the Northern Mills Company, of Canada, is at Ottawa most of the time lobbying in this matter. F. Howard Wilson, of the St. Jerome Paper Company, favors a prohibitive duty on pulp wood to secure the establishment of American mills in Canada. Adela Turgeon, minister of lands and forests in Canada, says:

It would be a great boon for the public domain if the federal government put an export duty on pulp wood.

A. G. Eagin, who buys pulp wood for export, says:

If Canadians would go into the pulp and paper business on a large scale, the situation would be altered.

If they did, it would be bad for the Americans. It would mean that Canada would eventually control all the trade in pulp wood, pulp, and paper. James Beveridge, of the Miramichi Pulp and Paper Company, says he would favor a prohibitive duty if he could be assured it would not result in a tariff war. Francis J. Conway, the surveyor-general of New Brunswick, expresses the same opinion. W. H. Rowley, of the E. B. Eddy Company, says:

What is the sense of sending our wood to build up a foreign country and furnish it with weapons to fight Canada in the commercial world? Canada for the Canadians means something.

Now, I am not going to take up your time by further quotations. I have only given a sufficient number, it seems to me, to demonstrate to the reasonable satisfaction of the gentlemen who are present here that there is a systematic, persistent, determined effort being made by Canadians and by the leading newspapers of the Dominion—by almost every person interested in the business—to either have Canada prohibit the exportation of pulp logs or else place such a duty upon the exportation thereof as to make it impossible for Americans to continue the manufacture on either side of the line. In order to meet such a condition as that and not have this great industry destroyed, there are only one or two things which stare them in the face. The principal thing is that they are fearful that if they impose an export duty on pulp logs, or prohibit them, we will levy a retaliatory or countervailing duty which will operate as disastrously against them as the prohibition of the exportation of pulp logs would operate against us.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman tell me why American manufacturers or American capital goes over into Canada to manufacture? Why do they not stay at home?

Mr. TIRRELL. I would say to the gentleman from Tennessee that they do not. They are not going to Canada to manufacture pulp paper. It is not necessary at present, and they do not go there.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I understood you to say that American capitalists go there to engage in the manufacture of paper?

Mr. TIRRELL. You misunderstood me entirely. I said that if logs were prohibited from entering this country or such an export duty was placed upon them that they could not be used here, then the American manufacturers ultimately would

have to go to Canada to carry on business there, because there would be no raw material to work on here—not an amount to keep these mills going. I do not mean but what there would be some manufacturing in Maine and very little in the West, but not enough to meet the demands, and it would amount to nothing in the long run.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman tell me what proportion of the pulp wood is imported from Canada?

Mr. TIRRELL. About one-third at the present time.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. How much capital is there invested in this business in the United States?

Mr. TIRRELL. I understood the gentleman from Maine to say that in his State alone there was about \$40,000,000 invested.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. About how many people are there engaged in the manufacture of the pulp?

Mr. TIRRELL. Tens of thousands, but I could not tell you. The amount of wages alone paid for pulp and wood amounted to \$32,000,000, and when you also add the labor which is involved in getting out the pulp wood, it will amount to \$40,000,000, and perhaps more than that.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. It has been charged through the press of the country that the manufacture of paper was largely in the hands of a trust, and for that reason the general public had been held up, and the price of paper has increased therefrom to all the people throughout the United States. I would be glad to know what the gentleman has to say in answer to this charge.

Mr. TIRRELL. I am coming to that, and I think I may as well take that up now.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. Another question, which the gentleman can answer in the same connection. There is no prohibition placed, or no export duty on manufactured paper in Canada; or is it only on pulp wood?

Mr. TIRRELL. The proposition now is to have an export duty on pulp wood. They do not want us to have free pulp; and their avowed purpose is to force American capital into Canada to make paper and pulp there, and discontinue as far as possible its manufacture here.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. But nothing on the manufacturers' product?

Mr. TIRRELL. Of course not; they want our market, and if they can stop our manufacturing they can send their pulp over here for us to buy, if we want to keep our paper mills going.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. Does not the one offset the other? When they undertake to put their price up, will not that enable our people to manufacture here and get into the market in competition?

Mr. TIRRELL. The trouble is there is not raw material here sufficient to keep the mills going.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. Is not that also a further reason why we should conserve our own timber for other purposes?

Mr. TIRRELL. We certainly should, and I want to say to the gentleman that the pulp and paper companies of this country own over 12,000 square miles of timber land in Canada. They have provided for the future. Not only that, but they have thousands of square miles in New Brunswick.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. Would this prohibitive export duty operate against the property that these gentlemen now own in Canada?

Mr. TIRRELL. Why, certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. They would have no right to export their own property?

Mr. TIRRELL. Certainly not, when the control of the ownership is in another country. I have not time to go into all these matters, but the situation in Canada is that there are immense tracts of Crown land. There are 104,000,000 acres of timber land in Canada, and a very large portion of this is what is known as Crown land. Now, these Crown lands are leased, and the leases expire within about two years. It is doubtful if any action will be taken until those leases expire, so far as the Crown lands are concerned, because those who have leased them did so under the implied agreement that they could sell the timber on them under the laws as they then existed.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. And remove the timber at their pleasure?

Mr. TIRRELL. Mr. Chairman, this is too large a subject for me to cover in the time which I have under my control, and I do not desire to be diverted further from my argument. I want to take up this matter of the paper tariff and some other things connected with the subject which I think are of very great importance.

I was very much surprised to listen to the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] the other day in reference to a "vicious paper trust." I asked him what company he had reference to, and he told me it was the International Paper Company. The territory, so far as the sale of paper is concerned, is practically divided, east of the Mississippi River, into two sections. There is a General Paper Company that controls the western part, and then there is the International Paper Company and independent companies that control the eastern part. It is true there is more or less selling back and forth, the eastern companies selling some in the West and the western companies selling some in the East, but not very much. Some draw the inference from that fact that there is an agreement between the two sections of country. As a matter of fact, if gentlemen are conversant with business in the northern part of the country, they must know that wood pulp and paper are very heavy articles to transport, and the freight rates are enormous. Pulp is sold to be delivered, and when you add to the price of the paper the cost of transportation, and take it a thousand miles away, you have increased the price so much that the East can not compete with the West and the West can not compete with the East.

It is just the same as it is in regard to all other lines of business where the transportation charges are heavy. Why, gentlemen, ten years ago a gentleman who was one of the leading boot and shoe jobbers in the city of Boston—I may as well tell you his name; he was my own brother—had been very successful and accumulated a competence in that business. He came to me, and he said, "Charles, I am going out of this business." He was in the western boot and shoe jobbing business, and one of the largest houses in the city of Boston. I said to him, "Why, you surprise me." He said: "Yes; I have figured this thing as carefully as I could, have kept awake nights over it, and I can not figure it out in any other way but that I must lose \$10,000 a year as long as I keep in this business. We can not compete with the western jobber in Chicago, St. Louis, Cincinnati, and other large western cities." He went out of business, and he saved his fortune.

He was the first one to do it. There were nineteen others in that business, with great warehouses and stores, in the city of Boston ten years ago, and I want to assure you, gentlemen, on my honor, for I know it as a fact, that every one of those western boot and shoe jobbing houses have either failed or gone out of business since that time because they could not compete with the cost of transportation and additional expenses with the western jobber.

That is all the answer I have got to make to that portion of the gentleman's address. He spoke about a vicious paper and pulp trust here in the East, and I have had the curiosity to look that matter up and propose to submit to you a few observations.

If there is a trust, and I understand a trust in this connection means a combination of individuals, companies, or corporations so organized into one that it is able to control the product, and is such a monopoly that it can raise at will the price. If there is any such monopoly in the paper and pulp business, or in any other business, I trust that all the laws enacted on the statute book and all the power of the Government will be exerted to break up that trust. I am opposed to successful wrongdoing in business or even in the private operations of the individual anywhere and everywhere.

If there is such a trust as that which is controlling the product and can raise the price of the output at will, the gentleman is correct, and the power of Congress, if necessary, should be evoked. I had the curiosity to look into this matter to determine that question, and I have sent for and have in my hand the last annual report of the International Paper Company of New York. I find in their statement of earnings, after paying the interest on their bonds and 6 per cent on the preferred stock, they have only a surplus, in a corporation capitalized at over \$50,000,000, of \$279,214.48.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIRRELL. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. What are the amounts of their stock and bonds; what is the capitalization?

Mr. TIRRELL. The capitalization of the company is, of preferred stock, twenty-two million and some odd dollars; common stock, \$17,000,000.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Is that an overcapitalization, or is it a fair representation of the property that they have got?

Mr. TIRRELL. It would take me fifteen minutes to answer that question. I am perfectly familiar with it. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will extend my time, I will stand here and answer it.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman put in the RECORD the details of the organization of the International Paper Company?

Mr. TIRRELL. I want to say that if the International Paper Company made as good a bargain when it organized its companies in 1898, making it out of twenty-four constituent companies, as they did out of one plant that I was trustee of, a large plant in Maine, they are the shrewdest and worthiest and best investors the world has ever known. As to the organization of the company the gentleman will see it would require an investigation for which now time and opportunity are not afforded.

Mr. HARDWICK. Well, the gentleman is familiar with the facts; let me ask him one more question.

Mr. TIRRELL. I can not permit it, much as I would desire to do so. I have so much to cover I must not be switched off.

Mr. HARDWICK. It is on that very point as to the organization of the International Paper Company.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will take the pains to answer my question in the RECORD when he prints his speech. I want to know if his company is overcapitalized?

Mr. TIRRELL. Do not call it my company. [Laughter.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Well, the company the gentleman is speaking about.

Mr. TIRRELL. I want to say here now that it would be impossible to duplicate the plant of the International Paper Company for any such sum of money, in my judgment, as is represented by their capitalization, but it is another question whether there was not originally what you might call overcapitalization in bonuses and in stock when it was organized. I want to say to the gentleman that outside of the first year, when they had a sort of half monopoly—as I will explain directly—they have never paid one dollar on the common stock.

Mr. HARDWICK. How much on the preferred stock?

Mr. TIRRELL. They never have paid over 6 per cent, and not only that, but I should add also that its preferred stock for years has not sold up to 90 per cent on the dollar, and only once at about that price. The average price I should estimate at about 71 per cent on the dollar. During the panic it sold as low as 54 per cent. It is now about 60 per cent. If it is a trust, it does not present any allurements to the speculative mind; rather, I should infer, it was having rather a hard time to keep up with the procession.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How much of the trade of the country does it control? That is what I want to get at.

Mr. TIRRELL. I must get on in a regular way, but I think I will answer all of these questions.

Mr. GARNER. Is there any other paper concerned in selling paper in the East?

Mr. TIRRELL. I will tell you all about it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman please tell how much of the trade that concern controls? I don't care how much water it has in it.

Mr. TIRRELL. I will answer that question now. The trade controlled by the International Paper Company, of New York, the first year of their existence, in 1898-99, was 60 per cent of the newspapers of this country; but mills have so multiplied and competition has been so fierce and the plants have been so extended that that percentage has gone down and down and down until now they are manufacturing only 40 per cent of the paper of the whole country and only 50 per cent of the news paper manufactured east of the Mississippi.

Mr. DRISCOLL. What proportion do they control in New York State, for instance?

Mr. TIRRELL. I must get on with my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. TIRRELL. Open up some new subject and I will try to answer the questions.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I think that is pertinent to this question.

Mr. TIRRELL. I will speak of that.

Mr. SMITH of California. I would like to propose a question, and the gentleman may answer it now or in the course of his remarks later—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIRRELL. Where is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM]? I want to know first whether I will get my time extended. I have only fifteen minutes left.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. TIRRELL. Who ever heard of a monopoly that never could pay 1 per cent on more than half of its stock, only 6 per cent on its preferred stock, sell only 40 per cent of news paper, and have surplus earnings in excess of all expenditures, including dividends, of \$279,214.48 only in one year on a capitalization of over \$50,000,000? Why, it is perfectly ridiculous, and answers itself. Then, again, to show that there is no monopoly in the paper business, I want to call the attention of the

committee to the fact that there are eighteen independent paper and pulp mills of large size making news paper in the eastern part of this country, in New York, Maine, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts. I herewith give a list of them, with their daily capacity:

NEW YORK.		Tons.
St. Regis Paper Company	-----	130
Taggart's Paper Company	-----	30
French, Pruyn & Co.	-----	60
Gould Paper Company	-----	35
Malone Paper Company	-----	25
Cliff Paper Company	-----	40
Pette Bone Cataract Paper Company	-----	30
High Falls Paper Company	-----	30
Remington, Martin Company	-----	60
Norwood Paper Company	-----	30
Raymondville Paper Company	-----	70
Scroon River Pulp and Paper Company	-----	20
NEW HAMPSHIRE.		
Berlin Mills Company	-----	215
MAINE.		
Great Northern Paper Company	-----	450
Bowdoin Paper Manufacturing Company	-----	35
Pejepscot Paper Company	-----	75
Lisbon Falls Paper Company	-----	50
St. Croix Paper Company	-----	80
Total	-----	1,465

These are all large competitors of the International Paper Company.

They are in direct competition with the International Paper Company. Competition is of the fiercest character. It is so fierce that I want to assure you gentlemen that there are only a few paper companies that have made any profit so that they have been able to declare any dividends during the last ten years. At times they have sold—and often in the past—paper for less than it cost to keep the mills going on account of the overproduction of paper in this country. I can give some illustrations that have come under my own observation. The greatest metropolitan journal in Boston is undoubtedly the Boston Globe. Their Sunday circulation is 311,000 copies, and they usually have an edition of forty to sixty pages. Their daily edition is in the same proportion. I go by their place of business week days when in Boston, because in that city is my place of business. I notice at their printing establishment that every day about half past 4 their paper arrives. Prior to about a year ago the International Paper Company had their label on the paper, but about a year ago the label on the paper was the St. Croix Paper Company, of Maine, an independent paper company that manufactures about 80 tons a day. The next most prosperous journal—in fact, the one, it is said, that makes the most money in Boston—is the Boston Transcript. Unless they have changed within the last year or two they have bought of independent paper companies. I have not inquired as to the other papers there. Go to the city of New York—the gentleman has referred to New York—and inquire about the New York World, the Times, or the Herald, and other journals, and you will find that they have more or less bought of these independent companies. The truth of the matter is that about the 1st of January, when the paper contracts are made in this country, the figures are sent in and contracts for the coming year made. The Great Northern Paper Company, of Maine, manufactures about 500 tons of paper a day. The Berlin Company, of New Hampshire, manufactures about 300 tons a day. All of these companies want to sell their products, and they make immense quantities of it. There are 1,300 tons of news paper made every day by these independent companies, as against about 1,000 tons made by the International. The International Company must meet them in competition, and the contracts are changing all the time, and they have to figure down to the very lowest possible amount.

Mr. GLASS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. TIRRELL. No; I can not answer any question just now. They have to figure down to the very lowest possible margin. I wrote to the International Paper Company. I wanted to see what they would say about these profits. I will read you a portion of the letter I received in reply. I think all of this will be interesting, as coming from headquarters.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. May I ask what headquarters?

Mr. TIRRELL. The International Paper Company.

Mr. GLASS. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. TIRRELL. No; I will not.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is a newspaper man.

Mr. TIRRELL (reading)—

Leaving out other lines than the manufacture of news paper, I can say that with possibly two or three brief periods of a few months in my experience of twenty-two years I have never known news manufacture, as a whole, to show more than a meager return upon the capital invested. There have been mills here and there which have made handsome profits, but, on the whole, this branch of the industry has

been subject to unbridled competition, which has been at times so fierce as to drive many mills to the wall and really threaten ruin to all.

The tremendous growth of the business has to a large extent been due to an effort on the part of individual manufacturers to save themselves by manufacturing on a larger scale. If only one manufacturer resorted to this expedient it might be all right, but when the majority do it it simply aggravates the trouble and leads to overproduction. This has been an almost chronic condition—viz, overproduction—so that in the effort to sell prices have been cut and the margin of profit practically wiped out.

Newspapers have taken advantage of the low prices to put more and more paper into their issues, and have become so spread out in this way, and so used to the price continually going down, that when the price halts or has an upward tendency they cry out that it is due to a monopoly.

Any industry ought to be entitled to a fair profit on the capital invested in it as a whole, as plants vary in efficiency according to their age and location. This means that mills representing average efficiency should make a fair return. It may be said of the International Paper Company that at the time of its formation it at least represented average efficiency, if not more than that, and the expenditure of money since has unquestionably made our plants, as a whole, better than the average plant engaged in the same line of manufacture.

You are perfectly safe in asserting that the news paper manufacturing industry is, and has been for years, run upon a most slender margin of profit. The very latest and best mills have scarcely been able to earn more than bare interest on their investment.

This brings me to the consideration of another matter suggested by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] namely, that this alleged trust of paper companies should be smashed to pieces, because it had raised the price of paper to an extortionate degree. Well, if that is so, of course no one could come to anything but the same conclusion. I desire, however, to show you that there is no great industry in this country where, in proportion to the rise of prices in other commodities, there has been so small advance made as by the pulp-paper makers of the United States.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman tell us how many companies are in this International Paper Company?

Mr. TIRRELL. Twenty-four.

Mr. GLASS. Will the gentleman tell me whether a newspaper publisher can not get a rate from any of these so-called "independent" companies of the country?

Mr. TIRRELL. That statement has been absolutely denied time and time again—

Mr. GLASS. Now, I am a newspaper publisher and I assert here you can not get a rate from an independent company.

Mr. TIRRELL. I know the gentleman is entirely mistaken in his position. I do not care whether he publishes a paper or not.

Mr. GLASS. I publish two, and I avow here I can not get a quotation from a so-called "independent" mill in this country.

Mr. TIRRELL. I decline any further to yield to discuss the question. Now, I want to say that this matter was called to the attention of the committee the other day by the gentleman from New York, but he did not call attention to the significance of the figures themselves. I find them appearing in his speech, and I desire, therefore, simply to refer to them to illustrate the point I am now endeavoring to make. In the first place, I wish to say that newspapers are a great deal cheaper now than before 1893.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have ten minutes additional, so as to enable him to answer some questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the time is in control of the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BINGHAM. How much more time would the gentleman desire?

Mr. TIRRELL. About fifteen minutes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I must confess I can not yield any time.

Mr. BINGHAM. I yielded to the gentleman two and a half hours to-day.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. But I have promised all of that time away.

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman fifteen minutes additional time.

Mr. TIRRELL. Now, I want to call your attention to the quotations on paper from time to time. Remember, gentlemen, that during all this period prices have been rising; then I propose to give you the figures as to the additional cost of pulp and paper; then I propose to show that the rise in the cost of manufacturing pulp and paper has more than doubled, and in many cases triple the rise in the price of paper itself. You will notice that practically the price of paper has remained the same for the past ten years prior to the last year. That appears from these quotations. In 1892 it was \$3 per hundred pounds; in 1893, \$3 per hundred; in 1894 and 1895, \$3 per hundred; in 1896, \$2.50 per hundred; in 1900, \$2.50 per hundred; in 1901 it fell to \$2.40 per hundred, and prices and everything else rising all the time. In 1902 it was \$2.25 per hundred; in 1903, \$2.50; in 1904 it fell again to \$2.40; in 1905 it fell again

to \$2.30; in 1906 it fell to \$1.90; in 1907, \$2; and in 1908 selling for \$2.50. In other words, if we take as a fair average the price of paper at \$2 during this period—it will not vary much from that—and then you put 50 cents on that, the present price, you have a raise of 25 per cent, have you not, on the price of paper during the last ten years, during this prosperous period?

What has it cost the pulp and paper makers during this time, and how have prices risen on them; and I ask you as fair-minded men whether they are not only justified in making this raise, but whether they have not been the closest figurers for the interest of the public that you ever heard of among the manufacturers of this country?

In the first place, as to the rise in wages. I sent to the president of the mill in which I am interested and asked him to write me in regard to that matter, and he answered as follows. This mill, you should understand, makes book paper, but the same general conditions are applicable:

First. The price of pulp wood since I have been connected with this company has increased from \$4.75 to \$7.50 per cord piled in our yards. The cause of this rise has been from an extra charge for stumpage on the part of timber owners and the largely increased cost in labor, especially that class of labor required in driving down our river.

Second. The increase in labor cost at our mill and in our yards has been about 40 per cent (common laborers, from \$1.15 to \$1.65 per day).

Third. The price of soda fiber is lower now than it was for many years, up to the "panic of '93," when it declined in price, until it finally was sold as low as \$1.80 per 100 pounds, delivered at our customers' mills. The present price so delivered is \$2.40 per 100 pounds, or an increase of a little over 30 per cent from the lowest point reached during the hard times of 1893 to 1897.

And the same must be true of all paper mills, because they are all connected in these matters, and one must charge as much as the other as a rule. I wish to add here another extract from this letter, not directly applicable to what we are discussing, but collaterally of great importance:

While the sale of pulp for export has increased largely in the last five years (the amount before that period being very small indeed), yet practically no sales are made for shipment abroad until after the home market is fully supplied. These sales dispose of the surplus only, which accumulates because there is no other way to keep down the cost to a reasonable point, without running the mills night and day every working day in the year. This reduces the cost of soda fiber to the domestic customer as well as to the foreign buyer, and it is also a fact that the price at which soda fiber is sold in this country for export makes it cost the foreign mill owner much more than it does the owner of our domestic mills.

After sales are fairly well established in any foreign port, a reasonable profit is made by the American manufacturer; and to-day, so far as soda fiber is concerned (I can not answer for sulphite), we consider our foreign sales the best part of our business.

I want you to bear these things in mind. There is an increase in labor cost between 30 and 40 per cent, which is one-third of all that is paid out in the mill itself, and two-thirds, if you reckon all the labor that goes into paper, going back to the forest where the timber is cut.

What else have they done for the wage-earners in these pulp and paper mills? They have not only increased their wages during this period 40 per cent, but they have cut down the hours of labor 8 per cent more. That is not all. In 1906, a little over a year ago, the pulp and paper mills of this country got together and said that they would adopt a three-four shift. Paper mills, you understand, must run day and night. They can not be idle a moment, because only by so running can you cut down the manufactured cost and sell the article for what it is selling to-day. They said, "We will put on three shifts of men instead of two." They formerly worked them twelve hours a day. They now work them eight hours a day in the paper mills of this country. If you figure that up you will find the labor cost has thereby been increased 62½ per cent more. In other words, you have got, adding on the increase that they have actually made, without reckoning the decrease in the hours of labor (8 per cent), and taking the whole thing together, an increase in labor—that is, in the labor cost to the manufacturer—of over 75 per cent.

Mr. SABATH. How do you figure that?

Mr. TIRRELL. I can not stop to do it.

Mr. GLASS. Who is paying that?

Mr. TIRRELL. I decline to yield. The gentleman will have my speech in the Record, and he will have the privilege of studying it and writing over the country for information.

Mr. GLASS. I have all the information I want, but the gentleman will not let me ventilate it.

Mr. TIRRELL. I have spoken about the labor in pulp and paper mills, but a more important consideration than that is the price of wood. When I first became familiar with the business you could buy all the spruce wood you wanted for \$4.50 a cord. It now costs, the wood cut in the United States, \$7.50 a cord and upward, and that price has increased since 1893. Therefore you have in the cost of the raw material itself an increase of from 60 to 70 per cent. It is almost double,

and in some of the New York mills it is double. I would like to ask any fair-minded gentleman if you are going to increase the labor cost in mills to the manufacturer, where one-third of all that goes into that mill is labor, 75 per cent; if you are going to increase the cost of the raw material, as it has been increased in this country during this period of time to almost double—on a most conservative basis 75 per cent—and also take into consideration that everything else connected with a paper mill has had the same increase in cost that all other manufacturing establishments have had; then I want you mathematicians to sit down and figure up the labor cost, the wood cost, and the additional cost which is put into manufacturing paper in our pulp and paper mills, and as honest and fair-minded men say whether or not it has not more than doubled up the cost to the pulp and paper manufacturer, while the cost of his paper, which has been selling under the fierce competition of this country, has only increased 25 per cent from the lowest average price.

Mr. BURLERSON. They want to give you cheaper wood.

Mr. BONYNGE. The wood comes in free now.

Mr. TIRRELL. I think, Mr. Speaker, I have given all the facts which I desire, unless some time is granted, and I can answer questions of gentlemen on the floor.

The sum and substance and gist of the whole matter is this: Our pulp and paper manufacturers are manufacturing at the lowest possible price consistent with existence and a meager profit. They are selling in open competition with the markets of the United States, a competition as fierce as exists in any interest in this country. They are manufacturing better paper than is made anywhere else in the civilized world, and they can continue to furnish paper at less cost and beat the world in doing it, provided they are protected as they have been protected by the Congress of the United States in all the years of its history from the beginning of the Government, not by the imposition of a trivial tariff of 15 per cent, which in itself does not amount to anything, but in the retaliatory or countervailing duty attached to the paper or pulp schedules or some other commodity to protect this industry in our country and prevent cutting off the importation free of the raw material.

If there are gentlemen on this floor who wish to see that industry wiped out, who wish to throw out of employment tens of thousands of American wage-earners and have them walking and moaning on the streets; if they wish to see the smoke and fires extinguished in the 108 mills now in the State of New York and the mills of the West and the industry hampered so that it no longer becomes a factor in the commercial development of the country, then it is only necessary to take the ground which has been assumed by some gentlemen upon the other side, without, I think, regard to facts or evidence to pass these bills to wipe out the tariff on pulp and paper and give to Canada the power to pass prohibitive export laws and close the mills of the United States. I, for one, believe protection to this gigantic and important industry is as necessary as to sow the great prairies of the West with wheat. And I can not see, from my investigation, any other conclusion than when this matter comes up in future Congresses for investigation and determination, the important question will be not of tariff on the articles, but its protection on the lines that I have indicated. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I now yield forty minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY]. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, in my efforts to entertain my friends on the other side of the House this afternoon, I want to take as my next text a little bill of four or five lines, which I have introduced, and which is pending now before the Ways and Means Committee. I send it to the Clerk's desk and ask that it be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16862) to place petroleum, crude or refined, and the products of petroleum, crude or refined, on the free list.

Be it enacted, etc., That petroleum, crude or refined, and the products of petroleum, crude or refined, of whatever kind or wherever produced, when imported into the United States shall be exempt from duty.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I propose to vary this afternoon the usual order of things. I am not going to attack the Standard Oil. The popular thing at the present time is to make bitter attacks on the Standard Oil, when you can not think of anything else to do. When in doubt, make a speech against the Standard Oil or send some vitriolic message down from the White House against that corporation.

I hold here in my hand the President's message of January 31, 1908. It makes a little pamphlet of eighty-one pages; two-thirds of it at least is taken up with an attack on the Standard

Oil. The most of the message and the best portion of it is contained in the appendix, which was not written by the President at all. His secretaries, with remarkable industry, have gone through all the leading metropolitan papers and other papers also and have succeeded in finding all the articles that in any way criticised the judge who assessed a fine recently against the Standard Oil, and all those articles are incorporated here in this message. The effort made by the President is to prove that he is engaged in a most terrific warfare on the Standard Oil, and that the metropolitan press is against him and is criticising the judge who made that decision. My experience is that the people are not finding much fault with the \$29,000,000 fine recently assessed against the Standard Oil Company, and the President will be unable, even in a message as long as this, to create the impression that there is much of a fight on at the present time between the Administration and the Standard Oil Company. [Applause on the Democratic side.] As a matter of fact the Standard Oil has not paid the fine of \$29,000,000 recently assessed against it, and there has been no effort made to collect it. Like the revision of the tariff, the collection of the fine has been postponed until after the election. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

When the elections are held the Republican leaders hope, and the Standard Oil managers hope, that the revision of the tariff and the collection of the fine will both be in the hands of the friends of the protective tariff, and in the hands of the friends of Standard Oil. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

What we need from the White House at the present time is less attention to the creation of a large Ananias Club and more suggestions of real value. The ear-splitting detonations from the White House for the last two or three years do not seem to have had much effect. The projectiles fired from that quarter are not of the armor-piercing variety. The trusts are all doing business at the present time at the old stand. Not one of them has quit. No prosecutions are being started. The condition of the trust-busting industry is similar to the condition the friends of ship subsidies would have us believe our shipping industry is in. They say that the keel of no ship is being laid at the present time in an American shipyard. It is equally true that the foundations for no trust-busting suits are being laid at the present time in the Department of Justice.

I started over a year ago in the trust-busting business myself. I spent two or three months collecting evidence against the watch trust. I wore out two pairs of shoes making trips from my hotel to the Department of Justice. I called the attention of the Department of Justice to certain facts. I produced the names and addresses of witnesses. I produced the evidence. I went so far as to prepare a brief as to the law. I submitted it all, but the prosecution of the watch trust, like the revision of the tariff and the collection of the twenty-nine million dollar fine, have all been postponed beyond the election. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, I am not going to abuse the Standard Oil, neither am I going to abuse my friends on the other side of this House. I want to talk this afternoon simply about the romance of oil, and incidentally the connection of the Republican party therewith.

Oil is produced in only a few places in the world. They produce some oil in Japan. They have produced it there from remote antiquity. They produce some oil in Roumania. They have produced it there for over a thousand years. They produce some oil in Austria-Hungary. They produce oil in small quantities in the Dutch East Indies, and they produce oil in the United States. But the great oil fields of the world are the Russian oil fields. The other fields, except those within the boundaries of the United States, do not amount to much and do not produce any considerable amount of the world's supply.

The Russian fields are the oldest, but until recently, and about the year 1896, they were not taken seriously. These fields were known in the days of Alexander the Great, and for over a thousand years oil was transported from the valleys of the Caucasus in buckets and tubs on mules and camels down the long desert trade routes to light the palaces and harems of oriental potentates. Some of the ancient cities around the Mediterranean were lighted with oil transported in this primitive way from the oil fields of Russia. The Russian oil field was known to oriental peoples for a thousand years as "the place of the eternal fires." The fire worshippers came there from far-away India. Their temples are still standing. Only twenty-five years ago the last of the Parsee priests, who presided in the temples of the fire worshippers, disappeared from that locality. But oil transported in buckets on mules and camels, Parsee priests, ancient temples, and fire worshippers

did not offer much competition for the Standard Oil, and did not attract much attention from that corporation to the Russian field.

But about the year 1896 the world commenced to find out about the Russian oil fields. For two thousand years that section, where the East and the West meet, had been deluged in blood. It was not an attractive field for the investment of capital. Geologists said that oil could only be found there at a comparatively shallow level—not deeper than 700 feet. But in the early nineties an English company, operating in a fertile valley of the Caucasus with modern drilling machines, penetrated the rocks to a depth of 1,500 feet, and the result was a great, gushing fountain of oil. They continued drilling in other directions and in other valleys, and everywhere there were produced great, gushing fountains of oil. There were 400 oil wells in operation in 1891, and in 1892 there were 900 wells in operation. Now there are over 2,000 wells in operation. But in 1892, when the Standard Oil was about to seriously consider the Russian fields, an outbreak of cholera occurred there and drove the workers away. Three years later, in 1895, they commenced slowly to come back and to go to work again, and the Russian Government commenced to build a railroad through the mountain ranges into the valleys of the Caucasus.

In 1896 they completed their pipe lines to the sea. At that time it was known in England and Germany that the great oil fields of the world were the Russian fields. The thing that frightened the Standard Oil Company the most was the fact that in the early part of 1896 fifteen or twenty modest-looking Russian gentlemen came to this country and, on foot, commenced to travel along the pipe lines of the Standard Oil Company, examining their pumping stations, getting from them ideas as to how the oil business ought to be conducted. The Standard Oil Company commenced to realize early in the year 1896 that if it was to retain its supremacy in the oil markets of the world it must protect itself at home from possible importations from the Russian fields. Like all great trusts which have become oppressive in their character, when threatened with real competition they rushed to the Republican party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And the Republican party opened wide its arms and took this odorous trust to its bosom.

At this time the Standard Oil had entered upon its world-conquering career. Its pipe lines extending across mountain ranges had reached the sea. Great iron tank ships owned by the Standard Oil were plowing the ocean highways of the world, carrying its products to all quarters of the globe. It was in control of the home markets, and it had commenced to reach out for the markets of the world. In order to be successful in its foreign career it was absolutely necessary to keep out competition at home; therefore it applied to the Republican party. The real crisis in the history of the Standard Oil occurred in 1896; it was safely passed when the Republicans carried the elections. They kept their contract and enacted the Dingley law. The Standard Oil, the old-line insurance companies, and their allied interests bought you with sixteen million dollars, and you delivered the goods.

In 1897 and in 1898 the Trans-Caucasian pipe line broke down, and for two or three years the exportation of oil from the Russian fields fell off to a marked degree. The Standard Oil seized this opportunity to more firmly intrench itself in foreign countries.

Then followed the labor troubles in the Baku fields, and finally that great region was again drenched in the blood of contending factions; again different races and different religions clashed in that part of the world as they have been clashing there for a thousand years, and British and German capital fled from that region. Oil derricks were destroyed, and refineries were razed to the ground. But a new era has within the last twelve months opened up for the Russian fields. The workers are returning, the iron hand of Russian discipline has fallen heavily in that quarter, and the Russian Government agrees to maintain order there. German and English capital, at the invitation of the Government, is flowing back into that section. The Russian oil fields are again becoming important as a source of supply. The time has come, if you really want to furnish competition for the Standard Oil trust, to pass the bill I have introduced, strike out this proviso, and let the oil from Russia come in. You do not have the courage to do it—you dare not do it. The other protected industries do not love the Standard Oil, but every man who enjoys the benefit of protection is willing to be sheared himself if he may have the delightful privilege of shearing everyone else. You are obliged to maintain the Dingley tariff intact—every comma and every period in it. You dare not do that which the people almost universally demand. You are owned now,

as you always have been and always will be, by great corporations and the criminal trusts.

In 1896 there was a national campaign in progress. An honest man, backed by an honest party, was making a fight for a larger circulating medium and was making the old fight for the rights of the people. It became necessary to defeat him! You made the fight for the Standard Oil and the old-line insurance companies. You took the \$16,000,000 they gave you, debauched the electorate and won, and you kept your word.

When the Dingley law was framed you took care of the Standard Oil. You provided that for all time, or as long as the Dingley law remained on the statute book, Standard Oil should be protected from all competition from the Russian fields.

Section 626 of the tariff act of 1897 places upon the free list at least fifty-six kinds of oil, and I do not know how many more. It places on the free list all spermaceti and all other fish oils of the American fisheries. If I knew how many fish oils there were I would know exactly how many oils are placed on the free list by the Dingley law. There are at least fifty-six, and to that number is to be added the number of fish oils manufactured. Orange oil is placed on the free list; olive oil is placed on the free list. Notwithstanding your alleged anxiety to protect the shipping industry from foreign competition, you placed upon the free list spermaceti, whale, and all other fish oils; and the man who goes out to sea on an expedition to bring back to this country the material out of which to make these kinds of oils, goes out knowing that the Republican party is not protecting him at all. Finally, and last of all in this list, you put on the free list petroleum, crude or refined, and then add to it this proviso, which applies not to the other oils, but only to petroleum, crude or refined, or its products:

Provided, That if there be imported into the United States crude petroleum, or the products of crude petroleum produced in any country which imposes a duty on petroleum or its products exported from the United States, there shall in such case be levied, paid, and collected a duty upon said crude petroleum or its products so imported equal to the duty imposed by such country.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. RAINEY. I will.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I take it from the examination the gentleman has made into the oil industry of the country that he has extended his inquiries into the protection the Democratic party gave to the Standard Oil Company in the Wilson bill.

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I will read—

Mr. RAINEY. I object to the gentleman's reading; I can read it if I want to. I will come to that.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is exactly the same language that the gentleman read from the Dingley law.

Mr. RAINEY. Is it? I will let the gentleman read it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Section 5 of the Wilson law says:

Provided, That if there be imported into the United States crude petroleum, or the products of crude petroleum produced in any country which imposes a duty on petroleum or its products exported from the United States, there shall be levied, paid, and collected on said crude petroleum or its products so imported 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. RAINEY. Yes, a very different thing from the Dingley Act. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is not the same thing at all.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is different in that it imposes a higher duty.

Mr. RAINEY. It is not the same thing at all, and I take issue with the gentleman from Kansas when he says that it imposes a higher duty; he shows that he has not been a student of the question of petroleum. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The law of 1897 imposes as much duty on importations from Russia as is imposed in Russia upon importations from the United States, and I want to show now, in answer to the gentleman, how much duty is imposed in Russia on oil that might be brought there from the United States.

I have here a letter from the Treasury Department, with certain exhibits attached, on this question, which is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, January 31, 1908.

Hon. HENRY T. RAINEY,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Replying to your letter of the 25th instant, requesting certain information regarding the rate and amount of duties chargeable on petroleum and petroleum products imported into the United States from foreign countries, I inclose herewith copies of Department's rulings of January 3, 1906 (T. D. 26961), and those of March 2, 1906 (T. D. 27170). In answer to your inquiries Nos. 1 and 4. I desire to state that the authority for the assessment of duties on petroleum and petroleum products is found in the closing proviso to paragraph 626 of the free list of the act of July 24, 1897. As the remaining inquiries of your letter have reference specially to statistical matters

regarding the importation of petroleum and petroleum products, your letter has been referred to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor with a request that a reply be forwarded to you as to those inquiries.

Respectfully,

J. B. REYNOLDS,
Acting Secretary.

(T. D. 27170.)

Paraffin—Countervailing duty.

Under the proviso to paragraph 626, tariff act of 1897, the duty on paraffin manufactured in Germany from crude petroleum produced in Russia is at the rate of duty imposed by Russia on paraffin imported into that country from the United States.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, March 2, 1906.

SIR: Your attention is invited to the decision of the United States circuit court of appeals, second circuit, of January 10, 1906 (T. D. 27025), wherein it is held that your decision was correct in assessing countervailing duty upon certain paraffin, manufactured in Germany from crude petroleum produced in Russia, at the rate imposed by Germany on paraffin imported into Germany from the United States.

The merchandise the subject of this suit was entered and the duties liquidated at the German rate on paraffin before the Department's decision of July 12, 1904 (T. D. 25457), was promulgated, wherein it was held that products manufactured in one country from crude petroleum produced in another country should be assessed with duty at the rate imposed by the country of origin of the crude petroleum upon similar products imported into that country from the United States, and not at the rate levied upon crude petroleum imported into such country from the United States.

As neither the Board of United States General Appraisers, the United States circuit court, nor the United States circuit court of appeals had before it for consideration the correctness of the Department's construction of the proviso to paragraph 626, you are hereby instructed to follow T. D. 25457 to the end that a judicial determination of the Department's construction may be had.

Respectfully,
(14951.)

JAMES B. REYNOLDS,
Assistant Secretary.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, New York.

CUSTOMS.

(T. D. 26961.)

Duty on petroleum and petroleum products.

Rates of duty imposed by Russia on petroleum and products of petroleum imported from the United States.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, January 3, 1906.

SIR: Referring to Department's circular No. 113 of November 20, 1905, I have to advise you that the Secretary of State transmits, under date of the 29th ultimo, information received from the American ambassador to Russia from which it appears that the rates of duty imposed by that country on petroleum and products of petroleum imported from the United States are as follows:

"Black crude naphtha and all unpurified naphtha, 30 copecks per pood.

"Liquid products from the distillation of naphtha (kerosene, photolene, paraffin oil, grease, naphtha ether, gasoline, ligroin, benzine, etc.), 1 ruble 80 copecks per pood.

"Paraffin, 3 rubles 31½ copecks per pood gross weight.

"Vaseline (other than refined), same.

"Candles, of all sorts, 5 rubles 4 copecks per pood."

Respectfully,
(14951.)

JAMES B. REYNOLDS,
Assistant Secretary.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, New York.

Upon refined petroleum imported from Russia, according to the statement I have just read, there must be collected a tariff duty of 1 ruble 80 copecks per pood, because that is the duty levied in Russia upon oils imported from the United States or from anywhere else to Russia—1 ruble 80 copecks per pood. The Treasury Department has never had occasion to figure out just exactly what this means, because none of it has ever been brought here. The law operates so as to absolutely exclude petroleum. One ruble contains 100 copecks, and 1 ruble is worth in our money about 51 cents. A pood is a Russian measure of weight and amounts to 36 pounds avoirdupois. If the gentleman will take the trouble to figure out the specific gravity of petroleum, as I have done, he will find that 6.11 gallons of crude oil at 61° Fahrenheit make 36 pounds avoirdupois, or a Russian pood. If the oil is refined it is a little lighter, but in round numbers 6 gallons of oil make a Russian pood. Therefore Russia imposes upon oils imported from the United States a tariff of at least 15 cents a gallon, perhaps a little more. Then, under the Dingley law, and under this proviso of such great advantage to the Standard Oil Company, if any oil were brought into this country from the only other oil region in the world worth speaking of, it would be taxed when it came to our ports at least 15 cents a gallon. Now, is there not a difference between 15 cents a gallon and 40 per cent ad valorem? Fifteen cents a gallon is just about three times as much or a little more than three times as much as 40 per cent ad valorem. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But I am not surprised to hear somebody on the other side defend the Standard Oil Company. No matter how nefarious a trust is, no matter how it is denounced, no matter how great a lawbreaker it is, you can always find some man on that side of the House ready to rise in his seat and defend it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In Russia they have two things which serve to demonstrate the fact that they are just emerging from barbarism—an infamous prison system and the

protective tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.] God grant that the fight going on there now—the moral upheaval and the movement for freedom—may soon release that country from both these curses. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

There is an honest and capable man at the head of the Bureau of Corporations, and he has very recently prepared this report which I have here on the petroleum industry—a book of something over 900 pages—a report not prepared in the interest of the advocates of the protective tariff. Herbert Knox Smith has given the facts in this book, and he shows in tables he has prepared the enormous price differences the Standard makes in this country, as compared with the prices it makes abroad. I am not going to read these figures, nor even to print them in my speech, but I want to read some of the conclusions Commissioner Smith reaches from the tables he has so carefully prepared, and I read now from page 427 of this publication:

The policy of the Standard Oil Company in charging much higher prices to the domestic than in the foreign trade is an injustice and an injury to the American consumer, which is not compensated for by any material advantage to American producers of crude oil or to American labor.

Now, some man get up on the other side and defend the Standard Oil when I am through. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is not so much the low prices in foreign markets as the exorbitant prices in the domestic market which require condemnation.

And I want to say now that the tables printed in this book show that the Standard Oil makes a difference of 5 or 6 cents a gallon on an average right along between its home price and its New York export price for oil. In this country during the recent years when the products of the Standard Oil refineries were constantly going up the same products 3,000 miles away on the continent of Europe were continually going down.

It is probable that prices in some of the foreign markets during part of the time from 1903 to 1905 were absolutely unprofitable. This furnishes, however, no excuse for the great advance in domestic prices. American consumers of petroleum might, for the sake of securing and retaining markets for the products of American industry, be willing to pay prices high enough to enable the Standard temporarily to sell oil abroad at cost, or even a little below cost, and yet make a moderate profit on its combined sales in both foreign and the domestic markets.

American consumers ought not, however, to be expected to pay prices so exorbitant that when the Standard sells half of its products abroad for little or no profit, or even with a loss, its aggregate profits on domestic and foreign sales combined amount to 60 per cent a year on its capital stock, as was true in 1904 and 1905. (See Chap. XIII, Table 152.)

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Some difference between the domestic and foreign prices might be tolerated, but such enormous differences as have existed, taken in conjunction with the excessive profits of the Standard, are clearly indefensible. If the object of the Standard had been merely to create a market for American products, it could have considerably increased the consumption in the United States by reducing prices to a reasonable level.

Now, I ask permission to insert in my speech at this point four or five other excerpts about as long as this from the comments of Commissioner Smith on the Standard Oil industry, without reading them now.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. RAINEY. The excerpts are as follows:

CHAPTER IX.—GENERAL CRITICISM OF EXPORT POLICY OF STANDARD OIL COMPANY.

SECTION 1.—INTRODUCTION.

It has been shown in the preceding chapter that the Standard Oil Company has, especially during 1904 and 1905, sold illuminating and lubricating oils abroad for very much less than the domestic prices. Before a final criticism may be made as to the Standard's export policy, it is, however, desirable to consider in addition to the prices certain conditions which have affected the foreign and domestic trade, respectively. The Standard Oil Company and its apologists have very frequently pointed to the enormous export business of the Standard as an evidence of the benefit of the concern to the country in furnishing an outlet for the products of American oil wells and American labor. It is often argued that the expansion of the export trade, or even the retention of it in the face of competition from foreign oils, necessitates at times the sale of products abroad at lower prices than in the United States. Apart from the question whether it is to the economic advantage of the people of the United States that domestic consumers should pay excessive prices for oil products in order to permit an increase or to prevent a decrease in the exportation of such products, there are certain considerations which show that the Standard Oil Company in its export policy has been actuated not by a desire to promote the interests of American crude-oil producers or of American labor, but solely by a desire to maintain and increase its control of the oil trade.

In 1902 began distinctly that disparity in movement between domestic and foreign prices which became so conspicuous in 1903. The domestic production increased somewhat over 1901, and this, together with a considerable decline in exports, increased the amount remaining for domestic consumption very considerably. The foreign production increased moderately, but the exports from the four principal foreign producing countries were less in 1902 than in 1901, and the total exports from these countries and the United States combined decreased more than 4 per cent. Notwithstanding this increase in the available domestic supply and decrease in the available foreign supply,

the domestic price advanced and prices in export markets declined. Though the price changes were comparatively small, they appear to have been abnormal.

SECTION C.—GENERAL CONCLUSIONS AS TO STANDARD'S FOREIGN POLICY.

The preceding analysis of the price policy of the Standard Oil Company in the export trade during recent years, as compared with its price policy in the domestic trade, shows two conspicuous facts. In the first place, while the prices of illuminating oil in the principal foreign markets have for years been relatively lower than the prices in the United States, this disparity became especially conspicuous during the years 1903, 1904, and 1905. During those years the domestic prices stood at a much higher level than for many years before, while prices in the principal foreign markets, particularly in 1904 and 1905, were sharply reduced, with the result that the average price in leading foreign markets, like the United Kingdom, Germany, and the Orient, stood at times from 2 to 3 cents below the average price in the United States, transportation costs, difference in quality of oil, etc., being taken into account.

The real reason for the entrance of the Standard into these foreign fields is its desire to get its products as cheaply as possible and its desire to maintain its dominant position. If the Standard can get supplies of petroleum products at various points throughout the world, it can save in transportation charges. Moreover, if the Standard could acquire a dominant position in the production or the refining of petroleum in those foreign countries which are now or are destined to become the principal exporters, aside from the United States, its control of the oil trade of the world would be more effectively assured. The Standard's one object is, evidently, to increase its control of the oil trade, regardless of its effects on the demand for products of American oil wells and American labor. Foreign governments, however, are well aware of the monopolistic tendencies of the Standard. In the Dutch East Indies and Burma the governmental authorities have prevented the Standard from getting a foothold, while in Roumania they have adopted measures to keep it from effecting a monopoly of production or of transportation of crude oil.

The practice of selling American products abroad at lower prices than in the domestic market is sometimes defended as a temporary expedient when there is a falling off in the home consumption. Under these conditions the practice may enable the manufacturer to keep his works in operation at full capacity, preventing hardship to his employees and derangement of the industry generally. Such a temporary exportation at low prices, however, is entirely different from the situation in the petroleum business, where from the beginning of the industry there has been an enormous export trade. American illuminating oil is indispensable to foreign consumers. Moreover, the marked reduction of prices abroad during 1903 to 1905 was not attributable to any decline of consumption in the United States.

Again, the practice of selling products abroad for lower prices than are charged at home is sometimes defended by the argument that the increase in the total volume of business which is thus made possible reduces the cost of manufacture per unit so greatly that the domestic price, though higher than the foreign price, may yet be lower than would be possible in the absence of the export trade. This argument, again, has no application to the petroleum industry. Particularly from 1903 to 1905 the excess in the domestic price of illuminating oil, as compared with the prices in the leading foreign markets, was much greater than the entire cost of pipe-line transportation and refining. It is obvious, therefore, that whatever small reduction in the cost of operation may have been attributable to the existence of a large foreign trade, the domestic consumer got no advantage from that reduction in cost.

The substantial monopoly which the Standard possesses in most parts of the United States, and the immense profits which it derives therefrom, largely furnish the sinews of war for conflicts in foreign countries. In the long run it is true that the Standard practically makes the people of the United States very largely bear the cost of its policy of domination in the world's markets.

The Treasury Department by its rulings can be depended upon always to add something to the stringency of the Dingley law. The proviso to which I have called attention has been construed so as to prevent the importation of the products of petroleum into this country from other countries, provided the crude petroleum originally came from Russia. Some time ago they attempted to import the products of crude petroleum from England to the United States, but the Treasury Department rushed to the protection of the Standard Oil and prevented it. The ruling of the Treasury Department, to which I have called attention, shows that it is impossible to import into this country from Germany paraffin, vaseline for manufacturing purposes, or candles made from crude petroleum which originated in Russia. The products so sought to be brought to this country are manufactured by citizens of Germany and belong to citizens of Germany, but Germany does not produce the raw material used in the manufacture of these products. Germany depends upon Russia for that, and Russia has a protective tariff affecting petroleum, as I have stated. Why further protect the Standard Oil and make possible these tremendous dividends by rearing a tariff wall under this proviso in the Dingley law against the products of petroleum that may come from Germany? Of course there is no demand for crude petroleum. The ordinary consumer has no use for the raw material, he simply wants the manufactured product; and under this law and under a Republican Administration the Treasury Department throws its protecting arm about the Standard Oil and says to Germany, "We will not permit you to interfere with this infant industry of ours."

The way to fight the Standard Oil is not to issue messages from the White House against it. [Applause on the Democratic

side.] That is a bluff, as these messages usually are. I learned early in life how to conduct a Fourth of July celebration and entertain your audience. You must keep always a rocket exploding in the air; they will never notice the falling sticks. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is the policy pursued in the White House at the present time. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Every day some new rockets explode in the air and until now the people have not commenced to notice the falling sticks. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If the President really has a grievance against the Standard Oil Company, if he really thinks it ought not to collect every year and divide profits amounting to 60 per cent on its capital stock, he can furnish some sort of competition for the Standard Oil and cut down its profits by simply sending a message here advising the Congress to put petroleum and its products on the free list. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But you can not do it and keep your contract—the contract you made in 1896 when they were pouring their money, they and their friends, into the coffers of the Republican party until you had accumulated a corruption fund of \$16,000,000. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That promise is not yet barred by the statute of limitations. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Whenever you make a contract with a particularly objectionable and nefarious trust—one which is universally admitted to be such—you invariably keep it. You dare not now pass this bill or any bill like it.

You are starting out in this campaign to make of it a campaign of bluff—simply that and nothing more. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Republican party proposes always to do a good many things after the election. If the returns show that they have a majority again in both Houses and have the Executive, then they say: "Our policies have been approved by the people; there is nothing else for us to do." [Applause on the Democratic side.] At the present time a new method has been devised by the Republican party to still further postpone the revision of the tariff, and they are beginning to announce themselves as being in favor of a tariff commission, the commission to be composed of experts and selected by the Republican managers, if they can carry the election this fall. The Republican idea of a tariff expert is a man who is either in favor of maintaining schedules just as they are or revising them upward. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Any man who advocates a different theory than this would not be a tariff expert, according to the Republican standard. He would be a visionary dreamer—unsafe and unsound. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And so, if they succeed in carrying the election again this fall, they are commencing to promise that they will give us an expert tariff commission to consider the tariff question, and they hope in this way to fool the people again.

We have been able to withstand three great defeats, and at the present time the Democratic party presents a united front to the enemy. You could not withstand three great defeats. You have not been able to stand three victories. [Applause on the Democratic side.] To-day your party is divided as it never has been before in its history. Why, you do not know who you are for for President [applause on the Democratic side] not a single man on the Republican side of this House. If there is anybody there who does know who he is for he is wise enough to keep still and say nothing about it. Occasionally you find a man from Illinois who says he is for the Speaker, and it is the wisest thing in the world to do that. If you are from Illinois, you can say to all the other candidates and their friends "We have got a candidate in our own State and therefore we have to be for him. If we did not have a candidate there, then we might be able to help you out."

You can find a few men from Indiana who will say they are for an Indiana candidate, but a great mass of candidates is accumulating, and troubles are in store for the Republican party. Already from the direction of Florida is approaching a dark cloud. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Down there we are told that ten or a dozen officeholders in the State of Florida got together and held a convention and all the negroes—and the negroes are the Republican party of the Southern States—got together and held another convention, and there are going to be contesting delegations from the State of Florida.

And you will probably square the matter, as you usually do, and keep solid with the negro vote in the North by admitting both delegations, with half a vote each. The other day in the State of Ohio you had snap primaries in order to get the State for Mr. Taft. About 10 per cent of the Republicans went to the polls and voted, and the others stood aside in sullen silence. They propose to hold another convention, and there will be contesting delegations from the State of Ohio. Are you going

to admit them with half a vote each? Already anti-Taft delegates are being selected in the State of Missouri, and your troubles have only started. You have not enough courage on that side to say you are for the Speaker, because that means the end of White House dinners this winter for all of you. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And you have not enough courage to say that you are for Taft, because that might interfere with your committee assignments, and so you remain quiet over there, without any backbone at all, and simply stand for nothing except the jobs you hold at the present time. [Applause on the Democratic side.] There is only one man in the Republican party who is spoken of as a candidate who really represents anything, and he represents money and the negroes, and that is Senator FORAKER. There would not be much of a Republican party in this country if it were not for the contributions from the trusts and if it were not for the negro vote. There are 32,000 negroes of voting age in the State of New York; there are 19,000 negroes of voting age in the State of Indiana; there are 32,000 of them in Ohio; there are 29,000 of them in Illinois, and I might go through all these other Northern States that at times are considered doubtful. They would rarely be Republican States if it was not for the negro vote. You must take care of the negro vote, and you can not do it when you turn down FORAKER. If you do turn him down, if you do not nominate him—and he is the only man that is making a real fight for anything except the nomination—it will be necessary for you to buy every negro north of the Mason and Dixon line in order to get them to vote the Republican ticket. The President is drying up your sources of income from the trusts, and you may be without the money to do it. The Republican party making a campaign without money and without negroes would present a pitiful spectacle in this country. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAINEY. I ask for ten minutes more.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I will have to take the time from somebody else. But I will risk it and give the gentleman ten minutes anyway.

Mr. RAINEY. The Democratic party is the white man's party in this country—in the North as well as in the South. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We have been able to make it a white man's party in the past, and we do not care how long it remains a white man's party.

We have been having a period of prosperity for twelve years, and for longer than that, in this country. For twelve years the sun has been shining when it ought to shine and the rain has been falling when it ought to fall, and men have been toiling on the farms of the West and in the workshops of the East and have been producing wealth as they never produced wealth before. This has not been a period of overproduction either, because until the last few months they did not have enough railroad cars in this country to move the crops from our Western farms and take back to the West the products of the East. Only last winter, so far were we from a period of overproduction, they did not have cars enough to carry coal to the men in the Northwest and their families who were freezing to death.

But all at once, after twelve years of this kind of prosperity, when the Republican party is still in power, entrenched as it never was before in its history, the wheels of commerce stopped. All at once from every direction there came the crash of failing banks. To-day in the streets of our large cities men are begging for work, women are begging for bread, and children are starving. When periods of depression have occurred before you charged them always to the party in power. Does the argument hold good now? [Applause on the Democratic side.] You have educated the people for twelve years to believe that prosperity depended upon one thing, and upon one thing alone, and that was the retention of the Republican party in power; and they have taken you at your word and have rolled up tremendous majorities in order to be prosperous and happy and in order to enjoy the plenty you promised them. What excuse are you going to make now? You charged us in 1896 with standing for a dollar that was worth only 50 cents. And yet a few days ago there was circulating in the country millions and millions of dollars' worth of certificates having back of them nothing but the fiat of a bank. I do not know how many of these certificates are still in circulation.

We made the fight for more money in 1896. You carried the election, but we won the fight. In 1896 we had a circulating medium of about \$21 per capita; and now, with a population many millions larger, with a population of 87,000,000, according to the last statement issued by the Treasury Department we have a circulating medium of \$35 per capita; and so thoroughly did we convert you to our idea in 1896 that to-day you are

clamoring for millions and millions of dollars more. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We made the fight in 1896, the old fight, for the people. We followed it in later campaigns with a fight for free men in the islands of the seas. To-day we turn from the fight for free men in the islands of the seas and commence the fight for free men at home [renewed applause on the Democratic side]; and whenever there is no great party in this country willing to take up that fight and to continue it, then will "government of the people by the people and for the people" fade from the earth. [Applause.] We stand to-day by our guns, as we always have, training them upon the enemy, facing the direction from which the greatest danger comes. We are getting ready to make, in the approaching campaign, the old fight against special privilege, and to continue the old battle for the rights of the common people. We await the result with confidence. Now, I yield back my time, if I have any left. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TIERRELL] makes the same request. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I got?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has twenty-seven minutes remaining.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, eighteen months have passed since duly chosen delegates to certain State conventions, Democratic and Republican, upon deliberation, declared in their platforms that the then and now existing tariff schedules ought to be revised and that their revision should be effected at once.

When these declarations were made the delegates to the conventions and the people who sent them knew that the first session of the Sixtieth Congress would begin on the first Monday of December, 1907. They knew also that in the following year there would be a Presidential election, but their knowledge of these things did not deter them from making such pronouncements. It may be assumed, then, that the people of the States, where such conventions were held and such declarations made, were of the opinion that the needs of the country demanded a readjustment of the tariff rates, and that such readjustment was of greater importance to the country as a whole than any possible effect it might have upon the political situation; that it was better that the welfare of the nation should be promoted, even at the cost of introducing an element of uncertainty into the political contest, than that the people of the country should suffer unfair and unequal burdens in order to prevent new questions arising on the eve of a Presidential campaign.

Before this Congress assembled it was quite generally reported through the newspapers that the tariff law would not be revised or modified during the long term. Evidently some one, or some body of persons, assumed the power to determine what should be done and what should not be done by Congress, and it begins to appear that the assumption was justified.

The Members of this body, chosen by the electors of their respective districts and delegated to represent those districts in matters of legislation, desiring to serve those whose interests they do represent, have introduced bills in great number looking toward the revision of various schedules of the tariff law. Presumably these bills have been introduced in good faith and in response to the instructions of many of the voters of the country who send representatives to this House. In a country like this, boasting of its free government and of the rights of all its citizens and of the equal opportunities afforded to all, it might be expected that some of these bills would be advanced far enough to engage the attention and secure the consideration of all the Members of the House, and after a proper investigation and reasonable debate be passed or be rejected, as to all the Members of the Congress seemed most advisable. And yet it is an open secret, or perhaps no secret at all, that these bills affecting tariff schedules are not to come before the membership of this House, either for passage or even for debate. Congress itself has not determined this matter. The bar interposed is found neither in the Constitution nor in statute law, but some one has assumed the right to decide upon the advisability of these measures and to determine whether or not the Members of Congress may pass upon them. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

In his message of last December President Roosevelt said:

There should be no tariff on any forest product grown in this country; and, in especial, there should be no tariff on wood pulp; due notice

of the change being of course given to those engaged in the business so as to enable them to adjust themselves to the new conditions. The repeal of the duty on wood pulp should, if possible, be accompanied by an agreement with Canada that there shall be no export duty on Canadian pulp wood.

A committee of the National Editorial Association, representing some ten thousand daily and weekly newspapers of the United States, petitioned Congress to remove the duty on wood pulp, printing paper, and material entering into the manufacture of printing paper. The Government Forester, after an extensive tour of inspection, declared that "in twenty years the timber supply in the United States on Government reserves and private holdings, at the present rate of cutting, will be exhausted, although it is possible that the growth of that period might extend the arrival of the famine another five years."

It is estimated that the forest area of the United States is from 500,000,000 acres to 700,000,000 acres, and about one-fifth of this area is made up of Government reservations.

The annual growth of our forests does not exceed the amount of wood used for lumber alone, and the annual consumption of wood is probably three times the annual growth.

It is claimed, and no doubt it is true, that an area as large as the State of Rhode Island is devastated every year by the paper manufacturers.

In view of these facts, is there any good reason why legislation looking to the removal of the duty on wood pulp and on print paper ought not to be considered now? Is not the power that can deny to Congress the right to legislate upon these matters too great a power to be exercised by any one man or by a coterie of limited number?

These are important facts and these demands are earnest demands. They deserve a better answer than that given upon this floor not long since by a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, who said, in substance, that these duties should not be removed without deliberation and a full examination of all matters connected with them, and then, laughingly, brushed the whole subject aside by calling attention to one bill for the removal of these duties in which, through an error of a stenographer, "white" paper was written instead of "print" paper. [Applause.]

No one has asked that these duties be removed without opportunity for full deliberation and a careful consideration of all questions connected with their removal, but Congress has been asked to deliberate upon these things, to examine them, and to decide whether or not these tariffs should be maintained for the benefit of the International Paper Company and the Association of Western Paper Makers, recently known as the "General Paper Company" and prosecuted by the Federal Government and compelled to disband.

On January 7 of this year the market price of the grade of paper used by the Minneapolis Tribune was \$52 a ton. Until recently that grade of paper was purchased by the Tribune for \$38 a ton. It consumes approximately 6,000 tons of paper per year. At \$38 a ton its print-paper expense approximated \$228,000 annually, while at the rate of \$52 a ton it will be \$312,000 a year, an increase of \$84,000 a year. But that is not the end of the story. The publishers were unofficially notified of a probable still further increase of \$10 a ton during the current year.

Of course this great increase is not directly due to the imposition of the tariff tax, which is, I believe, 30 cents per hundred, or \$6 a ton. The paper trust and the paper association know how to take advantage of a tariff rate as well as the other trusts and monopolies. If a foreign competitor is attracted to the markets of this country by the high prices obtained from purchasers, and establishes agencies, offices, and all the necessary adjuncts of a permanent trade, at no inconsiderable expense, the price of print paper will go down. With \$6 a ton advantage over the foreign paper maker, our manufacturers, who make their paper with just a little expense, can sell at a profit of \$5 a ton, and force the outsider, who pays \$6 to enter the market, to sell at a loss of \$1 a ton in order to meet their price. No wonder the territory is not invaded, but left to the control of the overcapitalized companies exploiting it and fattening on the high prices paid by the purchasers of print paper.

Yet the tariff must be let alone. This condition must continue. It is almost an offense to criticize it. This year there will be a Presidential election. Then will follow the short term of Congress. No time for revision. Then, unless an extra session be called, another election—a Congressional election—will be approaching, and the reasons for postponing tariff revision now may, with equal force, be urged then. [Applause.]

In the Indianapolis News, under date of January 6, appeared the following:

Speaker Cannon will not consent that a bill for a straight repeal of the duty on ground-wood pulp and on print paper shall come out of his Committee on Ways and Means; and all the stand-patters hold up their

hands in holy horror at the thought of "precipitating a tariff debate in the Senate" by handing to that body such legislation by the House. If there is any hope at all it is along the line of legislation removing the duty on print paper only.

Recently the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KÜSTERMANN] told us how the Standard Oil Company obtained protection under the provisions of the Dingley-Aldrich law. Approximately one-half of the world's production of petroleum comes from the United States; nearly an equal amount is produced in Russia, and a comparatively small amount by all the other countries in the world. Eliminate the Russian competition and all outside competition worth mentioning is eliminated.

Russia imposes a duty upon petroleum, and because of that fact petroleum coming to this country from Russia is subject to a tariff tax under this clause of the law:

Provided, That if there be imported into the United States crude petroleum, or the products of crude petroleum produced in any country which imposes a duty on petroleum or its products exported from the United States, there shall in such cases be levied, paid, and collected a duty upon said crude petroleum or its products so imported equal to the duty imposed by such country.

But the edict has gone forth that the tariff must be let alone. You may censure the Standard Oil Company as much as you please; condemn it because it suffers no competitor to thrive within this broad domain; prosecute it in the Federal courts; denounce it from the public platforms, but when it comes to a removal of the tariff tax behind which it shields itself from competition, and by aid of which it maintains the monopoly of which you complain, then the powers that be, beaming with patriotism and consumed with love of the plain people cry, "Hands off."

It will not do to disturb any tariff schedule prior to a Presidential election. [Applause.]

For good and sufficient reasons there has been no attempt to disturb this particular provision since the enactment of the tariff law a decade ago.

The gentleman from Wisconsin might have gone further in his investigations. He might have pointed out that bituminous coal imported into this country is subject to a tariff tax of 67 cents a ton, that anthracite coal apparently is admitted free of duty. He might have found another clause in the law very like the petroleum provision that attracted his attention and which he termed a "little joker."

Paragraph 415 of Schedule "N" reads as follows:

Coal, bituminous, and all coals containing less than 92 per cent of fixed carbon, and shale, 67 cents per ton of 28 bushels, 80 pounds to the bushel.

No doubt there is anthracite coal which is nearly pure carbon, but I fancy very little anthracite coal mined out of the United States, which, by any likelihood, may be imported into the United States contains more than 92 per cent of fixed carbon.

But it is an unnecessary and useless labor to investigate too curiously, for has it not been settled that Congress shall not legislate upon the tariff at this session?

Prices of lumber have been abnormally high, and the builders in the farming communities and in the cities have deplored the increased cost of building material. They are told that a tariff of \$2 on a thousand feet of lumber does not affect the price at all; that purchasers of lumber in Canada and elsewhere have to pay just as much for it as purchasers in this country pay; that the imposition of this tax has no effect whatsoever upon prices, and that it does not enable the owners of the lumber supply to charge any more than they would charge if the tax were removed.

Why, then, retain it? If the high price of lumber is due to a great demand and a limited supply, and competitors from abroad can not and will not bring lumber here and sell it for less than the market prices of to-day, and if the tax does not enable the owners of lumber to obtain more for it by keeping out this foreign competition, then let the tariff be removed. If its removal will lessen the price, surely a long-suffering people ought to be relieved of an unjust burden. If it will not affect the price because the demand exceeds the supply, then its retention can not be of any benefit to the lumbermen. It appears that this tariff tax is either unjust or useless, and in either case it should be cut out.

In the Twelfth Annual Report of the Forestry Commissioner of Minnesota this statement is found:

I have been at pains to ascertain how much lumber the average farmer in Minnesota who opens up a farm of 160 acres would require for the construction of his farm buildings, including his dwelling, barn, and other necessary buildings, such as shelter for his implements, and find that it would be 30,000 feet, board measure. Also that the average cost of such lumber at present is \$30 per 1,000 feet, amounting in all to \$900. Now, this is the amount and value at present prices of the lumber required by the average farmer.

In calling attention to these particular commodities, it is not intended to attempt a complete statement of all the reasons for the removal of the tariff duties upon them, but, very briefly

to present what may be termed a "prima facie case." If there are reasons, and good reasons, why the duty on print paper and wood pulp, and the duty on coal, and the duty on petroleum, and the duty on lumber should be retained, then, undoubtedly, this Congress, after hearing those reasons and being convinced by them, would not remove such duties. On the other hand, if, in justice, they should be removed, then they would be stricken from the statute.

These questions are important enough to receive consideration. They affect the property of millions of Americans whose representatives are here, and they have the right to say to us, "Devote yourselves to these things and report your conclusions to us. Do not evade the responsibilities that rest upon you. Let the issues be fairly met. Let a record be made."

At the next election not only will a President be chosen, but Representatives to the Sixty-first Congress will be selected, and the people have a right to know whether the candidates seeking their votes favor a removal of unjust tariff rates or their maintenance. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

It is said that there is insufficient time to take up the tariff law and examine all its schedules. There is time to take up the tariff duties on articles and things like those to which reference has been made, and many other classes of goods manufactured in this country and controlled by trusts and combinations seeking to monopolize the trade. The protective laws were first enacted for the purpose of building up competitive markets here at home at that time without domestic manufactures. Our home market then was at the mercy of foreign manufacturers who could ship their merchandise here and in fixing their charges take advantage of the lack of domestic competition. It was believed that by means of tariff taxes manufacturers here would be encouraged to produce American-made goods and put them in the American markets and there compete with goods coming from over the seas. The protective tariff was not designed to serve as a shelter for trusts and a shield for monopolies. The beneficiaries of these laws enacted to aid them have in many cases taken advantage of them to crush competition. They have used the weapon so generously provided by the American people against that very people.

The representatives of the people have higher duties to perform than to play politics and to plan for the future of political parties. The foremost leaders of both the great parties stand for the people and against the interests and systems and combinations and associations and corporations that have been plundering them. Patriotic men may, at this time, be less mindful of political campaigns and partisan advantages and more concerned with the efforts of a people to rid themselves of the burdens imposed on them by overfed trusts and monopolies.

Is not there time for the consideration of those tariff schedules that affect commodities that monopolistic concerns trade in? The Dingley bill, which its friends have denominated a magnificent piece of tariff legislation, was completed in less than four months.

The President in his message, to which reference has been made, referring to a general revision of the tariff law rather than a change of particular items, says:

The subject can not with wisdom be dealt with in the year preceding a Presidential election, because, as a matter of fact, experience has conclusively shown that at such a time it is impossible to get men to treat it from the standpoint of the public good.

This is rather a severe arraignment. Is it possible that this Congress can not take up the tariff schedules at this time and treat them from the standpoint of the public good? [Applause.] If it be so, then the electors of this country ought to send men here who at any time can take up important questions—questions that ought to be solved at once—and treat them from the standpoint of the public good. There must be some men in this country who can do it, and if the present course of non-action is continued in a very few years they are quite likely to be commissioned to do it in place of the men who can not at certain times treat these questions from the standpoint of the public weal. [Renewed applause.]

Necessary tariff legislation ought not to be postponed.

A large number of gentlemen who claim to be protectionists, but who think that tariff laws should be divorced from politics, came here to urge the appointment of a tariff commission. They seemed to know where it was necessary to go in order to learn whether or not Congress would listen to their petition. Members of this House learned through the newspapers that no tariff commission would be established.

How great the power this unseen autocratic body exercises! Conventions make their appeals, Congressmen introduce their bills, ten thousand newspaper publishers humbly petition, a phalanx of stalwart protectionists urge their plan, and millions of the American people protest against unjust and excessive taxes, but all to no avail. The controlling bureau, the auto-

cratic coterie, is unmoved. The ukase goes forth. There shall be none of it."

But the people are thinking all this time, and they are thinking hard. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOULDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the great favor of the gentleman, and shall not worry the patience of the House nor consume much of its time. I here present the petition for your consideration. It explains itself.

Mr. Chairman, in general debate alone on the great supply bills or others that must be considered in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union can any Member appropriately take the floor for any remarks on a question not germane to the matter in hand? In my long service here, the older Members all know that I have never taken the floor except to appeal for a right denied the people who sent me here or to oppose some injury threatened them. My reward for this course has been found in the attention you have invariably given me. You all remember the intense parliamentary battle fought out on this floor and in the Senate—a fight, the intensity of which has not been reached or touched since the historic conflict over the change of the rules led by the lamented Thomas B. Reed on his election to the Speakership of this great body.

That victory against joint statehood was won, and if I were called on now to pass from life to the dust that waits all life I would desire most to be treasured in the hearts of those whose confidence has sent and kept me here by reason of my course in preventing, as far as my energy, industry, and intelligence could, the unholy, unnatural, unjust, iniquitous union of two great western empires—Arizona and New Mexico—as one State of the Federal Union; but I did not take the floor to discuss that question, but what I have thus far said has been by way of introduction to this House of a remarkable as well as a most touching and pathetic petition just received by me from the county in which I live. It is signed by men, every one of whom is over 70 years of age, and nearly every one of whom blesses me with his confidence and friendship. Ordinarily I content myself, as you all do, in presenting a petition to Congress to merely present it and have it referred to the appropriate committee of this House, and that is usually the last of it. I must in this case digress from my usual rule, for those who have spoken in this petition have the right to be heard here.

The petition is as follows:

To the President and Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned, citizens and residents of the county of Pima, Territory of Arizona, and each of us qualified electors of said county, most respectfully petition the President and Congress that the Territory of Arizona shall be admitted as a State of the American Union. Our especial reason for petitioning as aforesaid at this time is that each and all of us are over the age of 70 years, and our opportunities for voting for a President of the United States are passing with our added years. We are desirous of exercising the great privilege of voting once more for a President of the United States.

We believe that the Territory of Arizona, on account of the worth, enterprise, and public spirit of her citizens, is entitled to admission as a State, and we hope to impress upon the President and Congress of the United States the duty of making such admission not only as a matter of right to the entire citizens of the Territory, but we feel that the great pleasure which will be afforded to us by the opportunity to vote at the next Presidential election should afford a pleasure to the President and Congress to receive our recommendation in this, our appeal, and we trust that our petition will receive a general and just recognition by the President and the Congress of the United States, and your petitioners will ever pray.

Dated, Tucson, Ariz., December 9, 1907.

Signed by—

WILLIAM HERRING (and 47 others).

This petition is signed by more than fifty of these grand old men, who, while you were surrounded with all the comforts of life, indulging in the luxurious ease of an advanced civilization, were building an empire at a cost of labor and hardship, trial and danger which you are unable even to imagine, building with a fortitude that ignored pain and privation, with a courage that saw, but feared not, danger.

And what reward have you given them for this work? Indians despoiled the homes of some of these men, and many others like them who have passed, pray God, to a reward which their country ignored. These men and those who have gone made civilization possible on the face of the forbidding desert—tunnelled the mountains, and poured into the lavishing arteries of trade the pure rich stream of golden blood that saved the life of the country more than once in its recent history. Such men as these, who speak through me to you, paved the way, after blazing the trail for that great number of younger men, who, inspired by their example, have made the West the most generous, the bravest, the truest, the most patriotic, and unselfishly loyal manhood that graces to-day the broad domain over which our banner floats. Yet, I repeat, what have you done for them?

You have prevented early settlers from the just recovery of claims for Indian depredations; you have sent a horde of strangers to fill their offices; you have turned a deaf ear to their every cry for justice, and yet they love their country and their flag, and would willingly surrender their few remaining days to the call in her defense. It staggers your belief, but it is true. What do they ask? They make no boast. Western settlers were not swashbucklers. They ask statehood for the country they made; they ask, like men, for the right of representation—representation to which they are entitled, by every requirement that Congress has ever demanded of any other people in all its history. Treat them as you may, the people by whom their age is surrounded will reverence, love, and cherish them, and, let us hope, that in this they may find some compensation for the violated promises of Congress; for its present refusal to grant their declining years the justice their labor deserves. [Loud applause.]

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill contains some astounding propositions. While realizing fully the difficulties that the committee must meet in a matter of this kind, it seems incredible that certain recommendations are made and others that should have been made omitted. It is the duty of that committee to act in a businesslike way, free from anything that might influence them in arriving at a just and proper conclusion. However, it would appear that the members of that hard-working and trying committee, some of whom would certainly fall under the unfortunate ban of having lived long and useful lives, would not be guilty of agreeing to the following item found on page 166, section 3, of the bill, which reads as follows:

The appropriations herein made for the officers and clerks and persons employed in the public service shall not be available for compensation of any persons incapacitated for performing the service for which such person has been employed, and the heads of Departments shall cause this provision to be enforced either by demotion or removal of such person from the public service.

If enacted into law, it will add undue strength to the powers now vested in chiefs of rooms and divisions, enabling them to easily make room for friends and favorites. It will undoubtedly bring about the removal of hundreds of deserving men and women whose only fault is that they have grown old in the service. In most cases of removal or demotion poverty will stare them in the face. In my judgment it is wrong, and in its present shape should not become a law. As I recall it, a somewhat similar proposition was in the bill last year, but went out on a point of order made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER], himself a living refutation of the charge of incapacity on account of years.

The same may be said of the distinguished gentleman having charge of the measure, namely, Mr. BINGHAM, the father of the House, and the Member from Georgia, Mr. LIVINGSTON, the able ranking member of the minority members of the committee. None of these distinguished gentlemen and statesmen, though up in years, deserve to be ostracized or relegated to the walks of private life. [Applause.] I am personally acquainted with many employees of the Government who have passed the three score period of life, who might be classed by a young and frivolous upstart in charge of a room or a division with being incapacitated, and thus be either dismissed or degraded by being demoted. I have in mind a woman 80 years of age, the widow of a gallant officer who lost his life on the battlefield of the civil war, who rarely misses a day and is competent to perform the duties of the position she so ably fills. I will cite one more of the many similar cases with which I am familiar. The law clerk of one of the auditing divisions of the Treasury, who has been there for forty years, and a regular encyclopedia of legal knowledge, who lost an arm in fighting the battles for his country's flag, a gallant officer of our brave volunteers, the admiration of the world, and though nearly 70, is a zealous and loyal official of the Government, whose head might, in the near future, be in danger should this proposition pass. This party receives the salary of \$2,000 a year, which, in my judgment, is less than one-half of what similar services and ability would command in any of our large cities. Now, these are fair examples of the condition of things in the various Departments. If the Congress believes that these old and faithful servants of the Government should give away to younger persons, a pension or retirement fund should be provided for them. Fifteen years ago, as a member of the board of education of the city of New York, I found many teachers and principals in the schools who had been teaching for forty years or more, but unable to retire on account of poverty. As is well known, the exactions of teaching and maintaining discipline is a most trying profession. Something had to be done, so a retirement bill was passed by the board of education and approved by the State legislature, giving those

incapacitated and who have seen thirty or more years of service a pension of one-half their salary, not to exceed \$1,000 yearly. This has since been raised to \$1,500 a year. Within a few years, quite a number of old teachers, mostly voluntarily, took advantage of this law, and relieved the splendid system of public education so ably presided over for twenty-three years by that prince of educators, Hon. John Jasper. The retirement of the teachers has been found to be a great benefit to the cause of education and a blessing to those who had given their lives to the noble work.

Let Congress be as humane and patriotic as the great Democratic city of New York, and then incorporate such a law on the nation's statute books. Until that is done, feeling men, men with humane, sympathetic hearts will not agree to thrust hundreds of good, zealous men and women, who have grown old in the service of the Government, on the cold charity of the world. [Applause.] This bill provides for a few increases, very properly, in my judgment. The character, ability, and intelligence required in the State, Army and Navy, the Interior, Post-Office, Commerce and Labor, and other Departments is of so high an order that \$6,000 is not too much. I regret that the committee did not recommend a larger increase. It has been my privilege to come in contact, officially, with most of these gentlemen, and I am glad to be able to say that they are all men of exceptionally superior attainments, men of high character, and always gentlemanly in the discharge of their arduous duties. While this meets my hearty approval, I have an indictment to bring against the great Committee on Appropriations. Why did they overlook the thousands of others who are justly entitled to an increase in compensation? It is generally admitted, I think, that the cost of living, food, rent, etc., has advanced 25 per cent in the last five years, making it extremely difficult for Government employees to make both ends meet. In my judgment the committee will do well to heed the recommendations made to the President recently by the Special Committee on Grades and Salaries. This committee, without any interest in the matter, recommends that an increase of 7.7 per cent more than is estimated for the next fiscal year be paid all Government employees. The committee should take this matter up and do justice to the most deserving class of men and women who have no superiors for zeal and devotion to duty anywhere in the country.

The great municipalities of the country are paying higher salaries, having made substantial increases in the last five years. Let justice be done the 15,000 or more employees of the Government, either by materially increasing the salaries, or in lieu of that, provide a pension for those who have grown old in the service. [Applause.]

I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks an article from the Washington Times of February 12:

OLD CLERKS MUST QUIT, SAYS BILL—MEASURE APPROPRIATING SALARIES ORDERS RETIREMENT—DEPARTMENT HEADS IN HUMOR TO ENFORCE PROPOSED LAW—ASSISTANT SECRETARIES GIVEN INCREASES BY SAME BILL.

Without warning, the long-feared blow has been prepared for the Government clerks of Washington by the House Committee on Appropriations.

In the legislative, executive, and judicial bill reported to the House by the committee providing for the payment of the salaries of all Government employees in Washington it is specified that aged and superannuated employees shall be demoted or dismissed without pension or compensation.

The language in which the provision is couched is emphatic and mandatory, compelling compliance, and not leaving the enforcement of it to the discretion of heads of departments.

It reads as follows:

"The appropriations herein made for the officers, clerks, and persons employed in the public service shall not be available for the compensation of any persons incapacitated for performing the service for which such person has been employed, and the heads of Departments shall cause this provision to be enforced, either by the demotion or removal of such person from the public service."

For the last three years there has been constant agitation before the Committee on Appropriations for the retirement of superannuated clerks on a pension or without pension. The committee has heard, in various ways and at various times, many plans advanced for dealing with the question of how to make the Government service economical by removing from it aged employees. There has been much discussion of a civil pension list, and various bills for such an arrangement have been introduced.

MAY BRING POVERTY TO THOUSANDS.

This year the committee has discarded all idea of pensions and has struck at the root of the matter by inserting the brief paragraph that will bring anxiety and, in many cases, poverty to thousands of the inhabitants of the national capital.

An argument for this action by the committee was advanced by Secretary of the Interior Garfield, when he was before the subcommittee in discussing the appropriations relating to his Department. Mr. Garfield told in graphic language of the good results he had obtained from dismissing and demoting employees when there was the slightest complaint against their efficiency. He said he had saved much money to the Government, and had secured better results from his policy of dismissal and demotion.

This struck the committee as a good line of action, and the paragraph for general demotions and dismissals followed.

WILL ENFORCE LAW TO LETTER.

That the heads of departments will not be allowed to let the administration of the law be hampered by mercy and leniency is the general opinion at the Capitol to-day. The language of the statute allows them no such privilege, and, if they fail to enforce it, they will be called to account for it in the next session of Congress.

Such a provision has been put in the bill because the committee believes it will result in economy to the Government. If this economy can not be shown at the end of twelve months, the Committee on Appropriations will want to know the reason why.

One argument used against the new provision is that it will add strength to the powers already wielded by petty chiefs of rooms and divisions, and will give them opportunity to obtain in easy manner the demotion or dismissal of any clerks whom they dislike or against whom they are in any way prejudiced.

If it is finally voted into the bill, it is possible that an amendment will be offered to create a special board to determine the efficiency or superannuation of clerks. The objection is now made that the terms of the provision give the chiefs a latitude that allows them to strike anyone without mercy and according to their whims.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LAWRENCE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 16882), the legislative appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY.

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I have received the following letter from the Secretary of the Navy:
FEBRUARY 12, 1908.

SIR: The Navy Department has the honor to invite the attention of the Executive to the necessity for the enactment of legislation whereby the representatives of the Government may have such control of wireless telegraphy as will insure noninterference with official messages.

The Navy Department has, by order of the President, the control of the Government coast stations, but unofficial messages sent by these stations or by public vessels may be interfered with by other wireless stations operated either by commercial companies with a legitimate object or by irresponsible persons with malicious intent.

Frequent occasions have arisen to illustrate the possible consequences of wireless interference: on one occasion an important message to the President of the United States, while embarked on a naval vessel, was interfered with and held up for a considerable time by the workings of a commercial wireless station; and instances have occurred wherein the naval stations at Newport, Washington, and San Francisco have at different times been interfered with by persons operating with no serious object.

The recent international wireless telegraph convention at Berlin, to which the United States was a party, deals only with "wireless telegraph stations open to public service between the coast and vessels at sea," and, therefore, does not take cognizance of stations operated by private individuals for other than public service. It may be noted, however, that article 8 of the convention requires that: "The working of the wireless telegraph stations shall be organized, as far as possible, in such manner as not to disturb the service of other wireless telegraph stations."

In view of the foregoing, the Navy Department recommends that such legislation be enacted as will insure freedom of official messages from interference. To accomplish this the law should make it a punishable offense:

(a) To originate or transmit a false message purporting to be official;

(b) To break in and interfere with any wireless station while it is transmitting an official message;

(c) To refuse to cease or fail to cease sending a private wireless message when called upon to do so by an operator having an official message to be sent.

It will be noted that the enactment of law of the nature proposed would never seriously interfere with the legitimate working of commercial wireless installations. The restrictions suggested are intended to apply particularly to times of peace. During war it is contemplated that much more extensive prohibitions would be exercised, to be put into effect in the absence of legislation by Executive proclamation as a belligerent right.

I am, sir, with great respect,

V. H. METCALF, Secretary.

I cordially indorse all that is above stated, and recommend the passage of such legislation as will accomplish the desired end.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 13, 1908.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS AND BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, the following resolutions were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

Senate concurrent resolution 24.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a survey and examination to be made of Beaufort Harbor, North Carolina, with a view to improving the navigability thereof, and providing a channel of 8 feet depth from the channel at the bulkhead in the Newport River to the town of Beaufort, and from the town of Beaufort to the channel at Gallants Point, and to submit estimates therefor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Senate concurrent resolution 26.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause an examination and survey to be made of the mouth of Chickasabogue Creek, in the State of Alabama, with a view to opening the same, and to submit estimates therefor—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Senate concurrent resolution 27.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause an examination and survey to be made of Bayou Le Batre, in the State of Alabama, with a view of deepening the same, and to submit estimates therefor—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Senate concurrent resolution 30.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made of that part of Bogue Sound contiguous to the town of Morehead City, N. C., beginning at the mouth of Hard Scrabble Slough, running westwardly between the said town and the marshes in front of the same to the main channel of Bogue Sound, on the west of Sandy Point Shoal, with a view of estimating the cost of obtaining a channel in said part of Bogue Sound, 100 feet in width and of a depth of 5, 8, and 10 feet at low water—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also:

S. 4924. An act for the relief of John H. Hamiter—to the Committee on War Claims.

EXPENDITURES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying documents, was ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department:

To the House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, in response to the resolution of the House of Representatives of January 20, 1908, calling for information concerning expenditures by the Department of State.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 13, 1908.

RESURVEY OF CERTAIN LANDS, NEBRASKA.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 13577) for a resurvey of certain public lands in the State of Nebraska.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to cause to be made a resurvey of the lands in township 25 north, range 15; township 33 north, range 16; township 33 north, range 16; township 26 north, range 31; township 34 north, range 32, and township 24 north, range 46, all west of the sixth principal meridian, in the State of Nebraska; and all rules and regulations of the Interior Department requiring petitions from all settlers asking for a resurvey and agreement to abide by the result of the same, so far as these lands are concerned, are hereby abrogated: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to impair the present bona fide claim of any actual occupant of said lands so occupied: *Provided further*, That before any survey is ordered it shall be made to appear to the Secretary of the Interior that the former official survey of said lands is so inaccurate or obliterated as to make it necessary to survey the land, and only such parts of the land where the survey is so inaccurate or obliterated shall be surveyed.

With the following amendment:

In lines 5 and 6, after the word "fifteen," strike out the words township 33 north, range 16; township 33 north, range 16."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask how much land is included in this resurvey?

Mr. KINKAID. Four townships.

Mr. PAYNE. What is the reason for it?

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Speaker, these resurveys are necessary because no corners can be found and homestead entrymen can not ascertain where they should place their improvements, especially their houses and barns and other improvements of a permanent character. It is, I maintain, an obligation of the Government to so restore these now obliterated surveys which were properly made in the first instance and improve others which were imperfectly made as to enable homestead entrymen to readily identify the numbers of the land which they may choose for their homes and homesteads. The condition is such at this time that great confusion exists and much inconvenience experienced on account of the lack of evidences of surveys to properly advise home seekers, settlers, and even surveyors. Most of these lands were surveyed nearly forty years ago and, while the surveys in some instances were evidently imperfect, in other instances, however perfect they may have been, they have become wholly obliterated by prairie fires and other causes, so that the home seeker is as helpless in identifying the numbers of the land he would take as a homestead as if no survey had ever been made. I repeat, the Government owes it to the homesteader to start him out with a good survey.

Mr. PAYNE. I think it is all right so far, but I notice something in the law about releasing contracts already made.

Mr. KINKAID. No, there is no contract about it. What you have in mind has reference to a former practice of the Department of the Interior of requiring all settlers to be affected by a resurvey to enter into a contract to be bound by such resurvey, and the provision referred to in this bill merely excuses the making of such a contract. Besides, there never was any law providing for such a contract or such a survey or resurvey made pursuant thereto, and the reference to such a practice in this bill is a legal superfluity.

Mr. MANN. It releases them from a petition signed by everybody.

Mr. KINKAID. It releases them from a practice that grew up in the Interior Department, but there was no statute requiring it.

Mr. PAYNE. There is, then, something in it about releasing from an agreement.

Mr. MANN. No; it does not require them to make any form of an agreement?

Mr. KINKAID. They are released from making any agreement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would like to ask the gentleman, reserving the right to object, if this is the unanimous report of the committee.

Mr. KINKAID. It is.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What committee.

Mr. KINKAID. The Committee on the Public Lands.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No objection was made to it in committee?

Mr. KINKAID. No; and it was referred to the Secretary of the Interior and report made thereon.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Recommended by the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. KINKAID. Yes, virtually; for no objection was made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. KINKAID, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. LAFEAN, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of Robert Thomas Doyle (H. R. 25201), Fifty-ninth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting the report of Special Agent Harry R. Burrill on trade conditions in Australia—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending legislation in relation to bonds of certain internal-revenue officers—to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Hatchee River, Tennessee—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Pensacola Bay, Florida—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of N. C. Fears, administrator of estate of W. S. Fears, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of M. F. Collier, administrator of estate of August Heberlein, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting

an estimate of appropriation for surveying and marking boundaries for Yellowstone Park—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HALL, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9205) to make the provisions of an act of Congress approved February 28, 1891 (26 Stat., 796), applicable to the Territory of New Mexico, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 896), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the resolution of the House (H. Res. 228) requesting the Attorney-General to furnish the House with copies of reports made by Mary Grace Quackenbos, on labor conditions of the country, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 894), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WANGER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16956) to authorize the Hydro-Electric Company to construct a dam across White River near the village of Decker, in Knox County, Ind., reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 897), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,
Mr. HALL, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1774) to permit Dollie A. Fountain, of Walworth County, S. Dak., to purchase certain lands, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 895), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 17036) relating to liability of common carriers to their employees—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 17037) to establish a fish-hatching and fish station in the State of Oklahoma at Mangum, Greer County—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 17038) providing that clerk hire allowed to Members of the House of Representatives be paid directly to clerk or clerks instead of to the Members—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. GREENE: A bill (H. R. 17039) increasing the pensions of nurses in certain cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 17040) to amend an act approved June 4, 1906, authorizing the use of the waters of Coosa River at Lock No. 4, in Alabama—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 17041) to provide for the erection of a public building at Shenandoah, Iowa—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McLACHLAN: A bill (H. R. 17042) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Pasadena, in the State of California—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 17043) providing for a memorial commemorating the preservation of the first permanent settlement of the English-speaking people on the Western Hemisphere—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 17044) to provide for the lading or unlading of vessels at night, to facilitate the entry of vessels, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 17045) to repeal import duties on antitoxin and diphtheria serum—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17046) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage

the industries of the United States," approved July 24, 1897—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17047) to appropriate \$150,000 for the prosecution and extension of the work of the Office of Public Roads in the Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17048) to appropriate \$500,000 for the prosecution and extension of the work of the Bureau of Soil Surveys in the Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17049) to repeal the duty on coal—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 17050) to amend section 18 of an act entitled "An act to enable the people of Oklahoma and of the Indian Territory to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of New Mexico and of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States," approved June 16, 1906, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 17051) to supplement an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers on railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their cars with automatic couplers and continuous train brakes and their locomotives with driving-wheel brakes, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1893, and amended April 1, 1896, and March 2, 1903—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 17052) providing for the erection of a public building in the town of Lexington, Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 17053) to authorize the drainage of certain lands in the State of Minnesota—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 17054) for the establishment of a park on the northern portion of the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation, in Idaho—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 17055) to validate certain acts of the thirty-seventh legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. McCALL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 136) relative to gaps in the published records of United States history—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SULZER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 137) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of Senators of the United States by direct vote of the people—to the Committee on Election of President, etc.

By Mr. MILLER: Resolution (H. Res. 236) for the payment of an assistant clerk to the Committee on Claims—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 17056) for the relief of Capt. Charles E. Morton, Sixteenth United States Infantry—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 17057) granting an increase of pension to Caroline King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 17058) granting a pension to Julia A. Cannon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17059) for the relief of Mate William Jenney, United States Navy, retired, and the eight other retired mates who have been placed on the retired list, with the rank and pay of one grade above that actually held by them at the time of retirement—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 17060) granting a pension to Mollie Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 17061) granting an increase of pension to Michael W. Cahill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17062) granting an increase of pension to John Salmon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 17063) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Buttrum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 17064) for the relief of the heirs of Aaron W. Da Costa, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 17065) granting an increase of pension to Leander Buttermore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17066) granting a pension to Clark Collins, jr.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 17067) granting an increase of pension to Asher Deitz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARRAGH: A bill (H. R. 17068) granting an increase of pension to Judson M. Francis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17069) granting an increase of pension to Anson Lowe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17070) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas Shults—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 17071) granting an increase of pension to George Champlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD: A bill (H. R. 17072) for the relief of Sarah E. Terrill—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 17073) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Perkins—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 17074) granting an increase of pension to Robert Magill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17075) granting a pension to Charles C. Meckel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 17076) for the relief of Frank H. Church, administrator of the estate of Cornelius Clay Cox—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 17077) granting a pension to Joseph M. Pence—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 17078) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McClure—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 17079) to authorize the payment of the claim of Jacob Rice Lewis, for services as a teamster in the Utah expedition—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 17080) granting an increase of pension to Enoch L. Waugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17081) granting an increase of pension to Silas Simms—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17082) for the relief of J. H. Willis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17083) granting a pension to Harriett A. Glasscock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 17084) for the relief of John Gentry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17085) for the relief of Newton Hodge—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17086) granting a pension to Nancy E. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIPP: A bill (H. R. 17087) granting a pension to Darius Heath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17088) granting an increase of pension to John G. Grant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 17089) granting an increase of pension to Greenville Tackitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17090) granting a pension to William Caldwell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17091) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Picklesiner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17092) granting an increase of pension to William H. Overly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17093) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Charles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17094) granting an increase of pension to Wesley Hager—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17095) granting a pension to George W. Brown—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17096) granting a pension to Matilda Kinser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17097) granting a pension to Christopher Alonzo De Hart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17098) granting a pension to John W. Puckett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17099) granting a pension to Milley Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17100) granting a pension to Absalom Hobbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17101) for the relief of J. C. Creed, of Winchester, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17102) for the relief of George H. Witten—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17103) for the relief of the legal representatives of James M. Bullock—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17104) to correct the military record of Sylvester B. Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 17105) providing for the presentation of a medal of honor to John J. Moran—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 17106) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Frederick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17107) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Stockbridge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 17108) to reinstate in the United States Navy on the retired list Henry Worthing Robie, of Portsmouth, Va.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 17109) granting an increase of pension to William P. Ray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POLLARD: A bill (H. R. 17110) to authorize the cancellation of trust patents in certain cases—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RHINOCK: A bill (H. R. 17111) granting a pension to Caroline Siebenthaler—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 17112) granting an increase of pension to George D. Steele—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 17113) granting a pension to John J. James—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 17114) for the relief of J. M. Johnston—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 17115) for the relief of Joseph W. McCall—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 17116) for the relief of S. R. Hurley—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 17117) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Eades—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STURGISS: A bill (H. R. 17118) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17119) granting an increase of pension to Sanson W. Smalley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17120) granting a pension to Cornelius Gandy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17121) granting a pension to Martin M. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17122) for the relief of William D. Graham—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17123) granting an increase of pension to George W. Chidester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 17124) granting an increase of pension to Mary T. Jennings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: A bill (H. R. 17125) granting an increase of pension to Erasmus B. Manahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 17126) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. Sheaffer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17127) granting an increase of pension to James B. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17128) granting an increase of pension to George Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17129) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Randall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17130) granting a pension to Harrison Wilkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17131) granting a pension to Edmond Castalor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17132) granting a pension to Ann M. Rothermel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY: A bill (H. R. 17133) to donate certain lands in Baldwin County, Ala., for educational purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 17134) for the relief of William S. Rote—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 17135) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin A. Anderton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of Glass Bottle Blowers' Association, of Alton, Ill., against S. 2026, relating to regulation of commerce in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Commercial Telegraphers' Union of America, for investigation of telegraph companies—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Daniel Baker, of Baltimore, Md., for legislation to regulate interstate commerce in intoxicating liquors—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National Academy of Science of Washington, D. C., for forest reservations in White Mountains and southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Dering Coal Company, of Chicago, for a bureau of mines—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petition of East Asiatic Society, of Boston, Mass., favoring joint resolution No. 90, concerning consular establishments in China, Japan, and Korea—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Southwestern Lumbermen's Association, of Kansas City, Mo., for legislation to authorize a census of standing timber—to the Committee on the Census.

Also, petition of Cronomer Valley Grange, of New York, for a national preserve in Highlands of the Hudson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Baptist Young People's Union of Ohio, for legislation to regulate interstate commerce in intoxicating liquors—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of legislature of Illinois, and petition of G. W. Robinson, of Garner, Iowa, for a volunteer officers' retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Minnesota Retail Hardware Association, praying for complete revision of tariff laws on iron and steel; also revision of bankruptcy law and removal of duty on lumber and logs—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of National German-American Alliance, in favor of additional forest reserves—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of American National Live Stock Association, for the creation of a nonpartisan tariff commission—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of National Academy of Science, in favor of forest reserves—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of State of New York, asking purchase of lands and erection of buildings for consular establishments—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of legislature of Illinois, favoring pensions for surviving ex-prisoners of war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of John Campbell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of Caleb A. Lewis, against order of Postmaster-General of December 4, 1907, denying the right of a publisher to extend credit for subscriptions to patrons of his publication—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: Petition of American Institute of Electrical Engineers, for forest reservations for timber supply—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of Citizens' Association of Bay Ridge and Fort Hamilton, for building battle ships in Brooklyn Navy-Yard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of National German-American Alliance, against immigration legislation—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of Ada W. Smith and Margaretha Loether—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHANEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Salmon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Michael W. Cahill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUNWELL: Petition of the Brooklyn League Temple Bar, for H. R. 4375 and H. R. 4377, providing pensions for widows and children of Doctor Lazear and Major Carroll—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of South Bend National Bank, favoring currency legislation—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of National Funeral Directors' Association, against burial at sea—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Otto Wicke, for H. R. 14639—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DUREY: Petitions of Brotherhood of Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers of Luzerne and Corinth, N. Y., for the retention of duty on wood pulp and white paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of D. Eaton, Gloversville, N. Y., against amendment of copyright law—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of National German-American Alliance, against any immigration legislation—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Minnesota Retail Hardware Merchants' Association, for legislation for improvement of rivers and harbors—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FLOYD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Daniel Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Illinois State Horticultural Society, for a parcels-post law and postal savings bank law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GARNER: Papers to accompany H. R. 3891, for public building in Corpus Christi, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petitions of Lyon Post, No. 8, of Oakland, Lincoln Post, No. 1, of San Francisco, and Admiral D. D. Porter Post, No. 169, of Oakland, Grand Army of the Republic, all of the State of California, for H. R. 220—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAFF: Petition of Union School District, No. 77, Tazewell County, Ill., for restoration to the coins of the motto "In God we trust"—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of H. W. Harslet et al., against H. R. 13477—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of W. H. Harslet et al., of Butterfield, Minn., against the passage of House bill 13477—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of Oakland Lodge, No. 284, International Association of Machinists, for building war ships in United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HEBBURN: Petition of H. E. Bunker and G. W. Tracer et al., citizens of Exline, Iowa, for legislation to enable the States to control shipments of intoxicating liquors upon their arrival within the borders of the State—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Brig. Gen. Hy. S. Merrill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of Reno Post, No. 84, Grand Army of the Republic, of Lakewood, N. J., for the Sherwood pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of J. C. Wade—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Wilford Drummond (H. R. 16557) and Adeline Summerville (H. R. 16691)—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: Petitions of Commercial Club of Perry, Iowa, and Iowa State Traveling Men's Association, against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KNAPP: Petition of W. H. Langdon, Fulton N. Y., against amendment of the proposed copyright law—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petition of Straban Grange, New Oxford, Pa., asking passage of S. 3152, providing for additional protection to dairy interests—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Straban Grange, No. 1334, New Oxford, Pa., for S. 3152, for additional protection to dairy interests—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Petition of Local Union No. 10, International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America, for repeal of duty on white paper and wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAYNARD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry Worthing Robie—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NORRIS: Petition of legal voters of Fifth Congressional District, Edison, Nebr., against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. NYE: Petition of Appomattox Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Minneapolis, Minn., for the Sherwood pension bill—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Petition of Oran Perry, for H. R. 14783, promoting efficiency of the militia—to the Committee on Militia.

Also, petition of Fred Miller et al., citizens of Indianapolis, against any constitutional amendment or treaty provision to

extend right of naturalization and for an effectual exclusion law against Asiatic immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RHINOCK: Petition of Trades and Labor Assembly, of Kenton and Campbell counties, Ky., for building battle ships in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of J. M. Breamy and T. C. Butts, of Rome, N. Y., and F. E. Abbott, of Little Falls, N. Y., against amendment of proposed copyright law—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona: Petition of old men residents of Arizona, asking for statehood—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of Typographical Union No. 531, of Gainesville, Tex., for removal of duty on wood pulp and white paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STURGISS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of George W. Chidester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the German Publishers' Agency, for the Kittredge copyright bill—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of Commercial Telegraphers' Union, for investigation of telegraph companies—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of John Cassidy, post commander of Devine Post, No. 148, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, for H. R. 12667, to remove charge of desertion against sailors and marines who joined the service during the civil war—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of E. Nattes, for amendment of copyright bill so as to protect musical composers—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of citizens of the United States, for postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TIRRELL: Petition of B. J. Healy and others, for construction of United States vessels in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Petition of Beers Post, No. 140, Tecumseh, Mich., for the Sherwood pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Michigan Association of Free Will Baptists, for the Littlefield original-package bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of citizens of Blissfield and Adrian, Mich., for restoration of the motto, "In God we trust"—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. WOOD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John W. Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of Edward C. Schmidt and H. M. Brinckerhoff, for H. R. 11562, for repayment of collateral inheritance tax to Stevens Institute of Technology, of Hoboken, N. J.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WATSON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Isaac M. Sheaffer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of Frank Livermore and 18 others, of Lycoming County; F. O. Steel and 57 others, residents of Tioga County, and J. C. Colgrove and 34 others, of Potter County, all of the State of Pennsylvania, for S. 3152, for additional protection to dairy interests—to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 14, 1908.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

STOCK OWNERSHIP OF INTERSTATE-COMMERCE CORPORATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting in response to a resolution of the 13th ultimo statements relative to corporations engaged in interstate commerce owning any capital stock of other corporations transporting passengers and freight, etc., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed.